

This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.

+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.

+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.

+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`



(Spencer)
ZMY
~~517~~

(Spencer)
ZMY

THE NEW YORK
PUBLIC LIBRARY
ASTOR, LENOX AND
TILDEN FOUNDATIONS.

COPYRIGHT, 1876,
BY J. A. SPENCER

RUSS PRINTING HOUSE,
NEW YORK.

TO THE

RIGHT REVEREND FATHER IN GOD,

John Williams, D.D., LL.D.,

PRESIDING BISHOP OF "THE PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,"

THE PRESENT VOLUME IS, WITH HIS PERMISSION,

SINCERELY AND RESPECTFULLY INSCRIBED

BY THE AUTHOR.

THE NEW YORK
PUBLIC LIBRARY
ASTOR, LENOX AND
TILDEN FOUNDATIONS.

COPYRIGHT, 1896,
BY J. A. SPENCER

BURR PRINTING HOUSE,
NEW YORK.

TO THE

RIGHT REVEREND FATHER IN GOD,

John Williams, D.D., LL.D.,

PRESIDING BISHOP OF "THE PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,"

THE PRESENT VOLUME IS, WITH HIS PERMISSION,

SINCERELY AND RESPECTFULLY INSCRIBED

BY THE AUTHOR.

THE NEW YORK
PUBLIC LIBRARY
ASTOR, LENOX AND
TILDEN FOUNDATIONS.

COPYRIGHT, 1896,
BY J. A. SPENCER

BURR PRINTING HOUSE,
NEW YORK.

TO THE

RIGHT REVEREND FATHER IN GOD,

John Williams, D.D., LL.D.,

PRESIDING BISHOP OF "THE PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,"

THE PRESENT VOLUME IS, WITH HIS PERMISSION,

SINCERELY AND RESPECTFULLY INSCRIBED

BY THE AUTHOR.

THE NEW YORK
PUBLIC LIBRARY
ASTOR, LENOX AND
TILDEN FOUNDATIONS.

COPYRIGHT, 1896,
BY J. A. SPENCER

BURR PRINTING HOUSE,
NEW YORK.

TO THE

RIGHT REVEREND FATHER IN GOD,

John Williams, D.D., LL.D.,

PRESIDING BISHOP OF "THE PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,"

THE PRESENT VOLUME IS, WITH HIS PERMISSION,

SINCERELY AND RESPECTFULLY INSCRIBED

BY THE AUTHOR.

THE NEW YORK
PUBLIC LIBRARY
ASTOR, LENOX AND
TILDEN FOUNDATIONS.

COPYRIGHT, 1896,
BY J. A. SPENCER

BURR PRINTING HOUSE,
NEW YORK.

TO THE

RIGHT REVEREND FATHER IN GOD,

John Williams, D.D., LL.D.,

PRESIDING BISHOP OF "THE PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,"

THE PRESENT VOLUME IS, WITH HIS PERMISSION,

SINCERELY AND RESPECTFULLY INSCRIBED

BY THE AUTHOR.

THE NEW YORK
PUBLIC LIBRARY
ASTOR, LENOX AND
TILDEN FOUNDATIONS.

COPYRIGHT, 1896,
BY J. A. SPENCER

BURR PRINTING HOUSE,
NEW YORK.

TO THE

RIGHT REVEREND FATHER IN GOD,

John Williams, D.D., LL.D.,

PRESIDING BISHOP OF "THE PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,"

THE PRESENT VOLUME IS, WITH HIS PERMISSION,

SINCERELY AND RESPECTFULLY INSCRIBED

BY THE AUTHOR.

THE NEW YORK
PUBLIC LIBRARY
ASTOR, LENOX AND
TILDEN FOUNDATIONS.

COPYRIGHT, 1896,
BY J. A. SPENCER

BURR PRINTING HOUSE,
NEW YORK.

TO THE

RIGHT REVEREND FATHER IN GOD,

John Williams, D.D., LL.D.,

PRESIDING BISHOP OF "THE PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,"

THE PRESENT VOLUME IS, WITH HIS PERMISSION,

SINCERELY AND RESPECTFULLY INSCRIBED

BY THE AUTHOR.

THE NEW YORK
PUBLIC LIBRARY
ASTOR, LENOX AND
TILDEN FOUNDATIONS.

COPYRIGHT, 1896,
BY J. A. SPENCER

BURR PRINTING HOUSE,
NEW YORK.

TO THE

RIGHT REVEREND FATHER IN GOD,

John Williams, D.D., LL.D.,

PRESIDING BISHOP OF "THE PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,"

THE PRESENT VOLUME IS, WITH HIS PERMISSION,

SINCERELY AND RESPECTFULLY INSCRIBED

BY THE AUTHOR.

THE NEW YORK
PUBLIC LIBRARY
ASTOR, LENOX AND
TILDEN FOUNDATIONS.

COPYRIGHT, 1896,
BY J. A. SPENCER

BURR PRINTING HOUSE,
NEW YORK.

TO THE

RIGHT REVEREND FATHER IN GOD,

John Williams, D.D., LL.D.,

PRESIDING BISHOP OF "THE PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,"

THE PRESENT VOLUME IS, WITH HIS PERMISSION,

SINCERELY AND RESPECTFULLY INSCRIBED

BY THE AUTHOR.

THE NEW YORK
PUBLIC LIBRARY
ASTOR, LENOX AND
TILDEN FOUNDATIONS.

COPYRIGHT, 1896,
BY J. A. SPENCER

BURR PRINTING HOUSE,
NEW YORK.

TO THE

RIGHT REVEREND FATHER IN GOD,

John Williams, D.D., LL.D.,

PRESIDING BISHOP OF "THE PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,"

THE PRESENT VOLUME IS, WITH HIS PERMISSION,

SINCERELY AND RESPECTFULLY INSCRIBED

BY THE AUTHOR.

Brief Note.

In this not over-large volume an attempt is made to deal, plainly and fairly, with a popular assumption of the Romish or Papal Church in America, and elsewhere. It is claimed, by those who owe allegiance to the Pope of Rome, that theirs is "*The* Catholic Church of God" in this world, to whom all existing churches, Eastern, Continental, Anglican, American, must bow, in humble submission and full acknowledgment of their having no right to existence, of any kind, without papal sanction and approval.

If this assumption be, as it is herein regarded, both baseless and impudent, it must be treated according to what it is. If, moreover, the reader, duly instructed in the faith of the Catholic Church (as set forth in the Catholic Creed, in the Book of Common Prayer), cannot yield assent or obedience to the Romish Creed of Trent and the Vatican, then let him bestir himself and carefully watch what Papalism is striving to accomplish here. Let him also fully understand that there is really no such thing possible as "*union* with Rome;" *submission* absolute is demanded, and will be enforced as soon as possible.

Papalism, be assured, will certainly fall; but the end is not yet. The truth of God will ultimately prevail; and the true Catholic must and can labor, with trustful confidence, to do his share towards bringing about this much to-be-desired result.

J. A. S.

New York, June 17, 1896.

CONTENTS.

PART I.

	PAGE.
PRELIMINARY, AS TO PURPOSE, ETC.,	9–11
CHAP. I. PLANTING OF THE CHURCH IN ROME: ST. PETER'S CONNECTION THEREWITH,	13–20
CHAP. II. THE GOSPEL TEXTS CLAIMED BY PAPISTS AS THEIRS,	21–32
CHAP. III. ROMISH CONTROVERSIALISTS AND THEIR BOOKS,	33–49
CHAP. IV. ONE OF THE LATEST ROMISH ADVOCATES AND HIS BOOK,	50–61
REVIEW AND SYNOPSIS OF PART I.,	62–64

PART II.

PRELIMINARY, AS TO TOPICS CONSIDERED, ETC.,	67–70
I. HOLY SCRIPTURE, THE WORD OF GOD,	71–81
II. THE ONE CATHOLIC AND APOSTOLIC CHURCH,	82–97
III. THE SOCIETY OF JESUS, COMMONLY KNOWN AS THE JESUITS,	98–111
IV. IDOLATRY OF THE CHURCH OF ROME; CULTUS OF THE VIRGIN MARY, ETC.,	112–125
V. PURGATORY, SATISFACTIONS, INDULGENCES,	126–131
VI. ROMISH TRANSUBSTANTIATION: THE CATHOLIC CHURCH'S REAL PRESENCE,	132–150
SACRIFICE OF THE MASS; AURICULAR CONFESSION; CELIBACY OF THE CLERGY (WITH SOME CLOSING WORDS),	150–159
REVIEW AND SYNOPSIS OF PART II.,	160–162
LIST OF COUNCILS; THE GREAT HERESIES; CHIEF EARLY FATHERS AND WRITERS,	163–165
INDEX,	167–177

PART I.

Historical and Exegetical. The Papal System in its Claims and Pretensions.

PRELIMINARY.

Some few words of explanation seem to be necessary at the outset, so as to place the reader and the writer on fair terms of relationship and accord, each with the other. This will be best accomplished, it is believed, by making it plain just what is proposed and expected to be done, in the present contribution towards a right understanding and settlement of a difficult and momentous question.

The *system* of the Romish religion is what is herein meant to be dealt with, in its principles and claims, its practices and results. If its principles be sound, if its claims be valid, if its practices in accordance therewith be honest and truthful, then its results cannot well be anything but good and commendable. If its principles and claims are largely false, deceptive, and odious, then its practices and results must necessarily, in great measure, be of the same character. Of course, under the Constitution and Laws of the United States, the Romish Church is at liberty to work freely and actively in support of its claims and purposes. As a body, its teachers are zealous, earnest, diligent, in striving to gather into their fold all whom they are able to reach. They keep a bright outlook as to politics, public moneys, free schools, etc., and they are fully alive to the importance of judicious care, in not pre-

senting at all offensively the harsh dogmas of Trent or the Vatican (1870), such as, the right to demand absolute *submission* to the "infallible," supreme head and ruler of all Christian people in the world, and also the right to chastise "heretics," and such like wretched creatures—just so soon as they are able.

With the *men* who have been drilled in and adopted these principles and claims of the Romish standards, in our day, and are trying to carry them out wherever possible, we have no present contest. Reluctance, and more or less of hesitation as to extreme dogmas, and the like, are now and then expressed by some of these; but the strong hand of power at Rome speedily puts down everything of the kind. We are not making any attacks on *persons*, neither are we imputing *evil motives* to papists. FACTS and TRUTHS alone are sought for; and nothing less will suffice. There are, doubtless, good and sincere men in the popish hierarchy, who really do believe—or at least are confident that they believe—everything to which they have solemnly sworn allegiance, however contrary it may be to the plain words of Holy Scripture, and the testimony of the Catholic Church.

Still further, it is not here questioned that there are good men and good women, in large numbers, who accept what is set forth in the standard Romish books (such as manuals, catechisms, books of devotion, etc.) for teaching the laity, as if it were, as is strongly asserted, authorized by the Bible, the ancient Catholic creed, and the witness of the first ages. They accept also the doctrines and practices laid down by the Romish Council of Trent in the sixteenth cen-

tury, embodied in the creed of pope Pius IV. (1564), and also by the latest astounding defiance of the Christian world (outside of Rome and the Jesuits), put forth by the Vatican Council and Decrees, in 1870. Even further yet, they avow their confidence that "the mother and mistress of all churches," as she loftily proclaims herself, does rightly, and even with divine authority, impose these intolerable burdens, under pains and peril of eternal damnation, upon all those who, stigmatized as "heretics" and "schismatics," refuse to become slaves of papal tyrants, and are true believers in the Lord Jesus Christ, and members of the One Holy, Catholic Church.

The purpose had in view, then, is (with God's help and blessing), to deal very plainly with the papal *system*, in its various ramifications and workings. We shall endeavor to do this as concisely as possible within restricted limits. We shall try to call things by right names. A lie is a lie, whatever name one gives to it, and so we shall call it. Equivocation, half-truths, amphibology of all sorts, mental reservation, and the disgusting stuff written down in the books of H. Busenbaum, A. Liguori, P. Dens, and the like, are essentially lying, and so may properly be termed. Forgery, out and out, as the Decretals of early popes, the Donation of Constantine, etc., falsifying the texts of ancient authors and the writings of early fathers, palming off paltry miracles, so called, are what they are, and to name them simply will, for the most part, be sufficient.

"ABSOLUTE OBEDIENCE, it is boldly declared, is due to the pope, at the peril of salvation, not alone in faith, in morals, but in all things which concern the discipline and government of the Church. Thus are swept into the papal net whole multitudes of facts, whole systems of government, prevailing, though in different degrees, in every country of the world. Even in the United States, where the severance between Church and State is supposed to be complete, a long catalogue might be drawn of subjects belonging to the domain and competency of the State, but also undeniably affecting the government of the Church; such as, by way of example, marriage, burial, education, prison discipline, blasphemy, poor relief, incorporation, mortmain, religious endowments, vows of celibacy, and obedience. In Europe the circle is far wider, the points of contact and interlacing almost innumerable. But on all matters respecting which any pope may think proper to declare that they concern either faith or morals, or the government or discipline of the Church, he claims, with the approval of a Council undoubtedly ecumenical in the Roman sense, the absolute obedience, at the peril of salvation, of every member of his communion."

WM. E. GLADSTONE.

PAPALISM VERSUS CATHOLIC TRUTH.

CHAPTER I.

Planting the Church in Rome: St. Peter's Connection therewith.

1. Attention is here first asked to the claim set up, by the makers of the Romish creed, as respects St. Peter's supposed connection with the Church of God in Rome. Observe, then, that, as a matter of fact, it is wholly unknown by whom, and at what date, the Gospel was proclaimed, for the first time, in the imperial city. Jews, an ever active, busy race, were quite numerous there before the Advent of our Saviour in the Holy Land. Some of these, if not many, went to Jerusalem, year by year, partly on business, partly or chiefly, to attend the great feasts of the ancient Jewish Church, viz., passover, feast of weeks, feast of tabernacles. Pentecost, the second named, was one of these high festivals, and it occurred just after our Blessed Master's ascension into heaven. St. Luke makes note of the fact, in his glowing account of the wondrous scene, when the Holy Ghost came upon the Apostolic band, and they were all filled with divine affluence, "and began to speak with other tongues, as the Spirit gave them utterance" (Acts ii.

1–4). The astonished multitude, made up of native inhabitants and visitors from "every nation under heaven," now heard, in their several languages, the gladsome news of salvation to be offered to the whole family of man.

2. It is quite natural that the "strangers of Rome" (Acts ii. 10) sojourning for the time in the Holy City, some being native Jews, others proselytes, should be amazed at hearing themselves addressed in their own mother-tongue by the inspired Apostles; yet, it cannot be doubted, we think, that some of these were part of the great harvest of three thousand souls gathered into the Church on that momentous festive day of Pentecost, A.D. 33 or 34. We do not know how soon it was that they returned to their Italian home, and carried with them the inspiriting intelligence of Prince Messiah's coming, and of His gracious promises of redemption, and happiness, and peace, through His atoning sacrifice on the cross; but the interval was probably not long.

3. Some years, doubtless, were spent by these, and also by others, on returning from the great annual feasts, in spreading abroad among their neighbors and kinsfolk the news from Jerusalem which they brought with them; as well as in providing for meetings of Christians, Gentiles equally with Jews, and for public worship and reading and studying Holy Scripture, in order to be assured, (like the Bereans of old) "whether these things were so," or not. Who it was that took the earliest steps in organizing the Church in Rome, and from whom it was that Christians secured the regular, authorized ministry of a bishop and other

clergy, no one indeed can certify. Just at what date Linus (named by St. Paul, 2 Tim. iv. 21), or whoever was first bishop, was consecrated for his high office, is wholly uncertain. So too, the date of Clement (also highly spoken of by St. Paul, Phil. iv. 3) cannot be affirmed positively. Bishop Pearson gives it A.D. 69–83. Others place the record of his death at A.D. 100. Clement notes, in his Epistle to the Corinthians (§§ 5, 6), the tradition of the deaths of St. Peter and St. Paul, in a time of grievous persecution, wherein great numbers of godly men were sacrificed. The Emperor Claudius banished Jews (and Christians too, of course) from Rome, A.D. 52; but on Nero's accession, two years later, they were allowed to return. St. Paul wrote his great Epistle to the Romans in A.D. 57 or 58, and notes cordially the high rank which the Church of God in Rome held at this date. He himself reached the imperial city in A.D. 61, and during two whole years—though "in bonds"—was actively engaged in helping to build up the Church of our Lord there.*

4. Now, as to St. Peter's direct connection with the imperial city, it is to be noted, that there is *no certainty* that he was ever in the capital of the empire at all. Tradition, as generally credited, makes him to have gone to Rome towards the close of his life, and

* See Bishop Lightfoot's excellent article on the "Epistle to the Romans" (Smith's "Dictionary of the Bible"). He states that "the Greeks formed a very considerable fraction of the whole people of Rome," and that, so far from the Church consisting mostly of Jewish converts, it was in reality, "a mixed Church of Jews and Gentiles, the latter perhaps being the more numerous."

to have suffered martyrdom there. This is *tradition*, be it remembered; it is not *certainty*, respecting a point of the gravest moment. Popish writers try to make out, by means of bold assumptions chiefly, that St. Peter not only went to Rome, but was also *bishop* of that see for some twenty to twenty-five years; yet no *evidence* of any value has ever been produced to show that such was really the case. Not only so, but as he was very advanced in age at the time of this pretended episcopate, the story must be regarded as having little or no foundation in *fact*. It is simply incredible, in view of what we know of the two apostles, that, if St. Peter were in Rome, and at the head of affairs, when St. Paul wrote his Epistle to the Romans, the noble and courteous apostle should pass over Peter's name and work in entire silence. Though he sends not less than twenty-five to thirty salutations, he nowhere alludes to his brother apostle (A.D. 58). The same remark is true in regard to St. Peter or his labors not being referred to, in any place, in the Epistles written by St. Paul, during his first imprisonment in Rome of two years, viz., Ephesians, Colossians, Philippians (A.D. 62), and 2 Timothy during his second imprisonment by Nero (A.D. 67 or 68). Tillemont, a Romish critic of high repute, makes St. Peter to have served as bishop of Antioch in Syria, about A.D. 36–42. Later on, in the first century, it is reported, by good authorities, that St. Peter visited Babylon on the Euphrates, where there was at this date a large number of Jews and Christians resident, and that he performed the duties of bishop in that city and vicinity for a considerable time. Some critics

give the date of his martyrdom, A.D. 64. His First Epistle contains a salutation "to the strangers scattered abroad throughout Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia," sent by "the Church that is at Babylon." * This would bring the date of the Apostle's going to Rome (if he ever did go) as late probably as A.D. 80 to 90. Canon Cook (in Smith's "Dictionary of the Bible") considers it "as a settled point that St. Peter did not visit Rome before the last year of his life." Favorite date of Peter's death (among Romanists) is A.D. 66.

5. Inasmuch as it is of vital importance to the popish cause that what is asserted about St. Peter should be clear and fully proven, the ablest controversialists and critics, among Romanists, have bestowed very vigorous efforts in this line. It is plain to every one, who desires to get at the truth, that, if Romish advocates cannot present satisfactory and convincing *proof* of what they affirm so confidently, then the whole papal system of doctrine and practice, built thereupon, falls to the ground. If assertion alone were sufficient, if repeating groundless assertions and guesses, century after century, made out their case, then they would be quite safe, and they might manufacture what they pleased into matters of faith and obedience. But assumptions, claims, pretences, and the like, do not suffice. Evidence which *is* evidence must be supplied, or Christians, who know their responsibility for their

* Romish writers for the most part hold, that the Babylon here meant is the mystical name for Rome (as in the Apocalypse). The Rheims New Testament says, in a note, that Babylon here used is "figuratively Rome."

souls' care and nurture, will not yield, and "cannot away with." Hence it is, under this pressure, that numerous books have been prepared by skilful, but not over-scrupulous, writers on the papal side, who undertake to show, as far as they are able, by Scriptural argument, as well as by the testimony of the fathers and doctors of the primitive Church, that St. Peter was made Vicar of Christ, Supreme Head of the Catholic Church, infallible, absolute monarch, in Church and State, over the whole world, etc., etc.

6. Let it be admitted, then, if the reader, in view of what is stated on preceding pages, choose to have it so, that St. Peter did actually make his way to Rome, and together with St. Paul gained there the martyr's crown. The question immediately presents itself, what did he *do*, after his arrival in the imperial city? Did he oust Linus, or whoever was bishop of Rome at the time, and take the chair for himself? Did he show, in word and act, what the papists say he was, that he was assuredly, by the Lord's own appointment, the Prince of the Apostles, and Supreme Ruler over the Church throughout the world, during some twenty to twenty-five years, as Jerome, at beginning of the fifth century, is reported as venturing to assert? Did he, as divinely appointed to this position, prepare a code of directions for his "successors" in office, that so they might set forth and enforce whatever he saw fit to command them? Did he define and make clear the "privileges of Peter," and mark out how these were to be taught and observed everywhere? Is there any *evidence*, and where is it to be found? Does anybody really *know* anything certainly

about the matter? Answers to these and like questions have never been given, or attempted, save in vague guesses, bold declarations that, of course, it is just as they say.

7. A word or two further: Suppose it were true that St. Peter was acting as bishop of Rome in the latter years of his life. Suppose, too, that he gave some instruction (more or less) to the person who was likely to be his successor. What, then, if this were the most that could be asserted? Is there any intimation, in Holy Scripture, that the Apostles were to have "successors" at all? Of course, it is well known, that, in the case of St. John and St. Paul, no one pretended to take up the work which these, and the others of the twelve, had laid down, with any such wicked pretence as that they were gifted with powers and prerogatives of the departed saints. It is in Rome that this strange work was begun, as time rolled on. It was there that it was taken in hand, centuries afterward, by men who resolved that, as Rome was the imperial city, so the Church in Rome ought to be, and should be, the imperial Church of the whole world. Some pretext or other must necessarily be put forward, and so it was attempted first, to make out that on St. Peter was conferred the *headship* and *supremacy* in the Catholic Church. It took two or three centuries to get this notion into general circulation. Still, there was a great gap even yet to be overcome. As there were no facts or evidence to be obtained out of Holy Scripture, or the history of the Church, assumptions must be made to answer instead. Acting on the pretty fancy that there *must be* a supreme guide and

master in the Church on earth, the Lord and Master in heaven was virtually dethroned, and St. Peter was set up in His place. Still a huge trouble remained, as to "the successors." Assumption is easy enough when one gets used to it. So it was gravely asserted, as if it were a truism and evidence were unnecessary, that, *of course* a "visible church" must have a "visible head," and therefore successors, in the shape of popes, were the ones to fill the blanks in ages to come. The Lord and Master never said anything about this pretended necessity of a visible head of His Church here on earth. The Apostles have nowhere asserted such necessity. The one, only Head of the Church is the Son of God Himself in heaven, seated at the right hand of the Father. Let the intelligent reader ponder these things, and steadfastly refuse to be put off, or imposed upon, with mere words, however plausible, which have no documents or facts to sustain them.

CHAPTER II.

The Gospel Texts claimed by Papists as theirs.

1. Romish writers, in their books, well knowing that the Scriptures contain but little which they can use for their purpose, labor especially to get all the help, which they crave, out of three passages of the Gospels, viz., St. Matthew xvi. 18, 19; St. Luke xxii. 31, 32; St. John xxi. 15–17. We ask the reader's careful attention to a brief, critical examination of the true meaning and force of these records of the Evangelists.

2. "And I say also unto thee, that thou art *Petros*, and upon this *petra* I will build My Church; and the gates of hades shall not prevail against it. And I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth, shall be loosed in heaven." This passage well deserves to be studied with thoughtful diligence, and we are confident that, if so studied, it will be found to afford very little if any help to the full-blown popish dogma about St. Peter. Let the reader call to mind the occasion on which the Lord spoke these remarkable words. It was just after the Saviour had asked the Apostles, "Who do men say that I, the Son of man, am?" and St. Peter, in response to the further question, "But who say *ye* that I am?" an-

swered for all as well as himself, "Thou art the Christ [Messiah], the Son of the Living God." The Master commended the answer, in the highest terms, as being a special revelation from God the Father in heaven, and thereupon uttered the significant words above given. Now, what do these words really mean? The Blessed Redeemer calls the apostle Petros, i.e., Rock, and then goes on to declare, that "on this petra or rock," He would build His Church. The question necessarily arises, what does our Lord here assert, by saying that there was a "rock," on which He was about to build His Church? The "fathers" (as they are usually called), the earliest interpreters of the Scriptures, vary largely in their expositions. Sixteen of these are on record as holding the "rock" to be the Divine Messiah, or *Christ, Himself*. Nearly fifty (including Augustine, Chrysostom, Ambrose, etc.) give their judgment in favor of the noble *confession* of St. Peter being the "rock." Some seventeen are of opinion that it was *Peter himself*, professing the faith. Besides, there are a few of the fathers quoted as holding somewhat different, but not hostile, views on this point. If the Saviour had meant, by "on this rock," Peter in person, and had said, "on *thee*, Peter, a rock in the foundation with Me, I will build My Church," then there would be something on which to base the popish claim; but He did *not* say any such words, and there is no valid reason to suppose that He meant any such thing, unless it be held, in accordance with what seems to be a favorite theory and practice of papists, that a perpetual repetition of a pretence for a thousand years does, in course of

time, make that to be true which was really utterly doubtful or false in the beginning.

3. The Romish contention is, that *petra* signifies *Peter*, and that the Lord here declares, that He purposes to build His Church on St. Peter, who was to become Head of the Catholic Church, and Supreme Ruler throughout the world. Popish folk know, however, to their discomfort, that the interpretation of the promise of building Christ's Holy Church, "on this *petra*," is not by any means settled among their most respectable critics and advocates. Neither does it have "the unanimous consent of the fathers." About this latter they say a great deal; but it is more words than anything else, seeing that nobody knows exactly who "the fathers" are, and what is to be understood by the expression "unanimous consent." A papal archbishop in Missouri (Dr. Kenrick) showed plainly, at the Vatican gathering (1870), that there were among the fathers no less than one hundred and thirty-eight who held, that it was St. Peter's "confession of faith" that was meant by *petra*, and not Peter in person. As this defiant, fierce assemblage in the Vatican was made up of five hundred or more cardinals, bishops of different sorts, abbots, etc., the Italians being largely in the majority, and consequently able to carry everything they pleased, all opposition to the Jesuits and the pope (who was present) was summarily put down. Of course, Kenrick's view of the passage wherein *petra* occurs was rejected, with an anathema, i.e., curse, added.—Very possibly, the long-delayed Nemesis may reach proud, haughty Rome, at no distant period.

4. It is proper to state, in this connection, that St. Peter was endowed with a "primacy" of some kind among the apostles; a primacy of personal worth, it may be, of reputation, of order, or the like. He possessed great boldness of spirit, was ever ready to take the lead, was frequently the chief spokesman, and was full of industry and activity. The records in the New Testament prove this to be beyond doubt. The popish contention, however, goes far in advance of this. While St. Peter shows himself, in the Acts of the Apostles and in his two Epistles, to be free from assumptions and magisterial airs, the papists of later days deem such an attitude quite beneath "his holiness, my lord the pope." Every extreme insolence of pretension and claim is coolly asserted by papists, here and now, in these days. They affirm that the "teaching of the Roman pontiff is infallible," though the Romish doctors and teachers are in much perturbation and doubt as to what is really signified by "the infallibility of the pope." Quoting the words from St. Matthew (xvi. 18), they go on to say, that "the holy Roman Church enjoys full primacy and pre-eminence over the whole Catholic Church, received from our Lord Himself, in the person of blessed Peter, Prince or Head of the Apostles, whose successor the Roman pontiff is;" and still further, that this Roman pontiff is "the true Vicar of Christ, and Head of the whole Church, and the see of holy Peter remains ever free from all blemish of error;"—if any one presume to contradict the Vatican dogmatic decrees, "let him be ANATHEMA" (accursed forever!). Add to this the shameless declaration of pope Boniface (A.D.

1300), that "every creature must obey the pope at the loss of eternal salvation." Let every one, who wishes to see and know what popery *is*, and *must be*, if it can only get the power in its hands once more, ponder awhile over the words of H. E. Manning, D.D.,—that papist of the papists in England,—in speaking of "the Temporal Sovereignty of the Popes" (1860); "the Catholic Church cannot be silent—it cannot hold its peace; it cannot cease to preach the doctrines of Revelation, not only of the Trinity and of the Incarnation, but likewise of the Seven Sacraments, and of the Infallibility of the Church of God, and of the necessity of Unity, and of the Sovereignty, both temporal and spiritual, of the Holy See." * Such words as these are among the things "passing strange," in view of the actual feebleness of the pope and Jesuits as to "temporal sovereignty." Yet, even Americans, glorying in their liberty of spirit and freedom of speech and action, as if these could never be taken away, will do well to watch the movements of a power, with its centre in Rome, and reaching out in every direction, so as to reconquer the world of human beings, and reduce all Christian people to *absolute submission*.

5. It is hardly necessary here to enter into any discussion of the Power of the Keys, and of Binding and Loosing (Matt. xvi. 19), seeing that precisely and fully the same authority was conferred on *all* the Apostles:

* "The Vatican Decrees in their Bearing on Civil Allegiance." By Rt. Hon. W. E. Gladstone. In the same volume is to be found Dr. Schaff's "History of the Vatican Council": New York, 1875.

"Verily I say unto you, whatsoever things *ye* shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven, and whatsoever things *ye* shall loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven" (Matt. xviii. 18). And after the Lord's Resurrection, at that memorable evening interview, "He breathed on them, and saith unto them, Receive *ye* the Holy Ghost: whosesoever sins *ye* remit, they are remitted unto them, and whosesoever sins *ye* retain, they are retained" (John xx. 22, 23). St. Peter never claimed or exercised any privilege in this matter over his fellow Apostles. "We know" (writes Cardinal Cusanus, early in the fifteenth century, an opponent of those striving to exalt unduly the pope) "that Peter did not receive more power from Christ than the other Apostles; for nothing was said to Peter which was not also said to the others: therefore, we rightly say that all the Apostles were equal to Peter in power."—See Cusanus on the *Councils of the Catholic Church*, quoted by Dr. Barrow (p. 68).

6. The passage from St. Luke (xxii. 31, 32) next claims attention and study: "And the Lord said, Simon, Simon, behold, Satan hath desired to have you, that he may sift you as wheat; but I have prayed for thee, that thy faith fail not; and when thou art converted strengthen thy brethren" (A. V.). Take note of the full and precise meaning of the original: "Satan hath greatly begged for you (plural, i.e., *you all of the twelve*) that he might sift you as wheat; but *I* (emphatic pron.) made supplication for *thee* (specially) that thy faith fail not; and do thou, when thou hast repented and turned back to duty and faith, stablish thy brethren." The last clause in this pas-

sage contains the important words, particularly by the direction which the Master gives, viz., "Confirm, or strengthen, thy brethren." They lack neither plainness nor clearness, as they stand. St. Peter, after the resurrection of the Lord and his own restoration to a position of trust and responsibility, and after the coming of the Holy Ghost, the Comforter, and Enlightener, and Strengthener of all Christ's people, was to do all that in him lay, by word and deed, to obey the Master's command. He was to aid and stablish his fellow-believers, remembering what he himself had gone through, and how the Gracious Redeemer, out of His infinite love and compassion, had saved him in the hour of terrible trial. His experience was invaluable, if rightly used; and from all that we learn of his career and course of conduct, during the remainder of his life (save only the one occasion when St. Paul was compelled to rebuke him openly (Gal. ii. 11–14),* he never forgot to strive, at least, to obey the Lord in all things.

7. In the hands of Romish controversialists, the plain record of St. Luke becomes wondrously changed. "Confirm," or "stablish," means here, they tell us,

* The Rheims New Testament gives the translation fairly enough (except substituting "Cephas" for "Peter"); but, after its fashion, in troublesome places, it supplies a queer sort of note on what the translators venture to term "a certain imprudence of St. Peter," by saying, "St. Paul's reprehending St. Peter was not any argument against his *supremacy*; for, in such cases, an *inferior* may admonish, and sometimes ought to admonish his *superior*." A shrewd evasion this, as well as crafty suggestion of St. Paul's *inferiority!* The thoroughgoing papist has his fling at the great Apostle, whenever he gets an opportunity.

that St. Peter was appointed "supreme guide" of all Christians, everywhere; and further, that he was, by the Lord's appointment, virtually put in the very place of God Himself, that is, he was to be the Universal Teacher and Director, always, in all things, and at all times (through his "successors" in the popedom of Rome). Jerome, early in the fifth century, is quoted as saying a strange thing—so strange as to be incredible—that even St. Paul, called and taught by the Lord Himself, "was not *secure* in his preaching, unless St. Peter *sanctioned* it by *his judgment!*" The simple fact on which this pretence is founded is the record that St. Paul went to Jerusalem to see St. Peter, some fourteen years after his first visit (Gal. i. 18). It is also asserted by Ryder (a recent writer, in behalf of Rome absolute and in full), that St. Paul was a "coadjutor," in a sense, but "*subordinate* to St. Peter." This is mere rash assertion, and the priest of the oratory disdains furnishing any proof. One enraptured popular advocate, in a book of which we propose to speak further on (pp. 43–49), uses, as to the Apostle, "the great and all-sufficient teacher," such language as the following;—"who will venture, at the risk of his soul, to deny that any special dignity or charge was conferred upon St. Peter, in preference to the other Apostles?"

8. The third great text is taken from St. John's Gospel (xxi. 15–17), and is one which Romish writers urge, with all their might, as upholding and substantiating their peculiar, established dogmas;—"Jesus saith to Simon Peter, Simon, son of Jonas, lovest thou Me more than these (love Me)? He saith unto

Him, Yea, Lord, Thou knowest that I love Thee. He saith unto him, Feed My lambs. He saith to him again, the second time, Simon, son of Jonas, lovest thou Me? He saith unto Him, Yea, Lord, Thou knowest that I love Thee. He saith unto him, Feed My sheep. He saith unto him the third time, Simon, son of Jonas, lovest thou Me? Peter was grieved because He said unto him the third time, Lovest thou Me? And he said unto Him, Thou knowest all things: Thou knowest that I love Thee. Jesus saith unto him, Feed My sheep." The just and truly Catholic interpretation of this significant record by St. John is in substance this: Peter had fallen, had repented, and had been forgiven. The Lord puts the question to him in such wise as must have pierced his very soul. Peter had foolishly boasted of his devotion and love,— "Though I should die with Thee, yet I will not deny Thee" (Matt. xxvi. 35); "I will lay down my life for Thee" (John xiii. 37). Thrice is he asked, "Simon, son of Jonas, lovest thou Me?" and thrice Peter answers, in deep humility, "Yea, Lord, Thou knowest that I love Thee." Very striking are the words which the Gracious Master used, in His charge to the penitent apostle to do what He now commanded, by helping and guiding others to do the same; "feed My lambs, tend and guide My sheep, feed My little sheep," the choice, loved ones of the flock. Peter was restored to his former position of honor and repute among the apostles, at the same time being solemnly, though silently, warned in regard to possible danger in the future. And when, not long after, he and the eleven with him were filled with the Holy Ghost,

St. Peter stands out prominently, in the earlier chapters of the Acts of the Apostles, as active, zealous, industrious, continually at work (frequently in company with St. John), and truly blessed in his work, never ordering others as a master, but working always in company with those whom the Divine Lord had chosen to work with him. After the sensible and effective speech of Peter, in the Council of Jerusalem (Acts xv. 16–21), he appears no further in the record by St. Luke. We have his two Epistles, it is true; and well do they deserve to be read and studied by Christian people, particularly by those who are striving to elevate the Apostle into a supreme headship and authority in the Catholic Church. As to St. Peter's later life and career, there are only scanty remains in ancient writings. (See Chap. I., pp. 15–19.) It seems strange that this meeting of the Saviour with St. Peter, and the touching words which He spoke on that occasion should be so grossly perverted, as they have been, by zealous, resolute papists. These affirm, (without any pretence of evidence) that, at this time, and by these words of the Lord, there is given to St. Peter, and—stranger still—to all the popes of Rome, an absolute control over Christ's Church and people throughout the wide world, both then and for all time to come. The Apostle Peter is alone the shepherd, they tell us. He may hand over a portion of this assumed divine authority to others, if so he pleases; but, he himself is, nevertheless, Supreme Pastor, the Vicar of the very Lord Himself. And still further, as the result, the same absolute power is conferred upon not only decent and fairly good men, but upon

all the graceless wretches of popes in the middle and dark ages.

9. Testimony of several fathers of good repute (third to fifth century) may properly here be noted, as to the purport and force of the passage above quoted from St. John. "All of them (the twelve) were shepherds; but the flock did appear one, which was fed by the Apostles with unanimous agreement." These are the words of the distinguished Cyprian, martyr-bishop of Carthage (A.D. 250), from his valuable work "On the Unity of the Church." He was a true Roman, and alive always to the majesty of the empire, with its single, supreme head. Basil the Great, bishop of Cæsarea, Asia Minor (A.D. 374), thus writes: "And we are taught this (i.e., obedience) by Christ Himself, constituting St. Peter pastor, after Himself, of the Church; for, Peter (saith He) lovest thou Me more than these? Feed My sheep; and conferring on all pastors and teachers continually an equal power (of doing so); whereof it is a sign, that all do in like manner bind and do loose as he." Ambrose (close of fourth century) affirms,—"Which sheep and which flock not only then St. Peter did receive, but also with him all we priests did receive it." Augustine, the great Latin theologian, bishop of Hippo (early part of the fifth century), writing "On the Agony of Christ," declares that, "When it is said to Peter, it is said to all, Feed My sheep." "He the Lord is a Pastor; He gave also to His members; for both Peter was a pastor, and Paul a pastor, and the rest of the Apostles were pastors, and good bishops are pastors." Chrysostom, the noble bishop of Constantinople (end of fourth

century), discoursing "On the Priesthood," says, "Our Lord did commit His sheep to Peter, and to those who came after him." Cyril, bishop of Alexandria (A.D. 420) writes: "It was a lesson to teachers, that they cannot otherwise please the Arch-pastor of all than by taking care of the welfare of the rational sheep."* Some words from the eminent Bishop Pearson ("On the Creed," p. 485) deserve to be here added. He gives a passage from Cyprian's work (as above), in which this early father refers to passages about St. Peter being "the rock on which I will build My Church," "feed My sheep," etc., and then goes on to say:—"this is very much to be observed, because that place of St. Cyprian is produced by the Romanists to prove the necessity of one head of the Church on earth, and to show that the bishop of Rome is that one head by virtue of his succession to St. Peter; whereas St. Cyprian speaketh nothing of any such one head, nor of any such succession, but only of the origination of the Church, which was so disposed by Christ that the unity might be expressed. For whereas all the rest of the Apostles had equal power and honor with St. Peter, yet Christ did particularly give that power to St. Peter, to show the Unity of the Church which He intended to build upon the foundation of the Apostles."

* We take these quotations from Dr. Isaac Barrow's great and unanswerable work on "The Pope's Supremacy" (8vo, pp. 597). The reader will do well to study this volume, if he desire to become master of the subject, in its details.

CHAPTER III.

Romish Controversialists and their Books.

1. The advocates of the truth and excellence of the Romish religion, and its consequent obligation upon all human beings, have found it necessary, from time to time, to bestir themselves in its defence. They have prepared, and put into circulation, various books; some large and pretentious, in the way of quoting (after their rather unique manner) authorities; others (and chiefly) the smaller manuals or handy books, and Catechisms, intended mostly for the uneducated, the working classes, etc. These latter furnish numerous readers with popery in the concrete, and are based almost wholly upon assertions, guesses, assumptions, etc. Unwilling to make the present a large or bulky volume, instead of one which any intelligent reader can readily handle, we have come to the conclusion that it will be best and fairest, all round, to select two or three popular, approved volumes, issued by Romish controversialists, in repeated editions, and to show how they labor to support their claims and pretensions before the world, at the very close of this nineteenth century.

2. We begin, then, with a stout octavo (pp. 520), entitled "The Faith of Catholics" (i.e., of the papal

sort).* It was first published some seventy-five to eighty years ago, and has held a place of honor among Romish folk ever since, as the work of an esteemed priest, belonging to the schismatic branch of Rome in England, Rev. J. Berington. He was aided by Rev. J. Kirk, a fellow-priest, and the joint work of these two has gained much credit, and is sometimes referred to as unanswerable. The avowed design of Berington and Kirk is to prove, by Holy Scripture and the fathers of the first five centuries, that the Romish faith is the one only true faith. The dark and dreary region beyond, when the papal monarchy of pride and power prevailed, and showed to what enormities it was equal, so soon as it became supreme master and lord, is discreetly not entered upon. It is quietly assumed that Rome and its so-called creed were the same always after, whereas history proves, beyond all contradiction, that neither pope nor leaders of the fifth century (like Leo I. and his kind) ever made any pretence of holding such tenets, or having such power and rank, as the Hildebrands, and Innocents, and Bonifaces of mediæval times, and the "high talking" popes and Jesuit managers in later centuries.

3. Berington and Kirk's work contains a number of short passages or texts from the Bible, such as, four Old Testament prophets, the four Gospels, the Acts, the two Epistles of St. Peter, seven or eight of St. Paul's Epistles, and St. James. There are also given

* Full title: "The Faith of Catholics on Certain Points of Controversy, Confirmed by Scripture, and Attested by the Fathers of the First Five Centuries of the Church." By Rev. J. Berington and Rev. J. Kirk.

select excerpts from certain of the "fathers," as they are called. The writers lay down various "propositions" (about forty in all) in a rather skilful way, always assuming that, whenever "the Church" is named by an ancient father or commentator, it is "the Roman," or in subjection to Rome, which is meant. They furnish carefully chosen and manipulated extracts, apparently in support of Romish dogmas, professedly from men of note during the early Catholic ages. The three Apostolic Fathers are of necessity briefly quoted, for the first century; with Justin Martyr, Irenæus, Tertullian, and Clement of Alexandria (at close of second century); Origen, Minutius Felix, Cyprian (p. 32), and some half dozen others, for the third century; Eusebius, the historian, fourth century, with Basil, Ambrose, Epiphanius, Athanasius, Chrysostom, Jerome, and about twenty others of no great account; and for the fifth century, Augustine, Cyril of Alexandria, Theodoret, Vincent of Lerins, Socrates, the historian, and a number more of little known writers. A few specimens of the mode practiced by Berington and Kirk in the quoting and using the fathers and early writers may properly here be given.

4. They begin, as to "The Authority of the Church," with Irenæus (end of second century): in cases of "dispute, recourse must be had to the most ancient churches, where the Apostles resided:" "it is a duty to obey the priests of the Church," so as not to be suspected of being heretics or schismatics. Clement of Alexandria and Tertullian (contemporaries of Irenæus) are quoted; but their words simply assure

us that "there is only one true Church," and that the Apostles taught the world the doctrine which they receive from Christ. Reference is made to Origen as teaching that "the Scriptures are to be adhered to, according to the sense which has been delivered by them," i.e., "Apostolical men;" and that "that alone is truth, which in nothing differs from ecclesiastical and apostolical tradition." Cyprian of Carthage, in his treatise "On the Unity of the Church," quotes our Lord's declaration to St. Peter, as being the rock on which He will build His Church, and asks the question (quite pertinent, in view of Romish corruptions), "Can he, who does not hold this unity of the Church, think that he holds the faith?" Athanasius, the noble and illustrious champion of the true faith against deadly heresy, has received and entirely deserves the reverence of Catholic Christians in all ages. The papal dogma of supremacy, in its offensive, godless form, had not yet made any perceptible progress; consequently, Julius, bishop of Rome at that date, treated Athanasius with the courtesy and love of a "brother bishop" (his own term), and largely aided him towards returning to his post of duty in Alexandria, the second patriarchate in the Catholic Church,—Rome claiming to be the first. Berington and Kirk give, in a passage translated by them from one of his Epistles, the following:—"Let us consider from the earliest period the tradition, the doctrine, and the faith of the Catholic Church, which God first delivered, the Apostles proclaimed, and the succeeding fathers fostered and preserved. On these the Church is founded, and whosoever falls from her communion

neither is, nor can be, called a Christian." About a hundred pages are devoted to this topic; some three hundred and fifty pages additional are filled with their notions as to "Apostolical Traditions," which, they dare to say, "have come down in an unbroken series of *oral delivery*, from the Apostolic ages!" Tertullian is made to affirm (in italics), "*to the Scriptures an appeal must not be made!*" implying that there is great danger, if you do so appeal, that heretics and such like will gain the victory. So, too, the first Four General Councils, "assisted by delegates from the Roman See," (a shrewd addition), proclaimed the true doctrine, which Rome graciously accepted, "as agreeing with what, in the sum of doctrine," she already believed. Following this, come "the Primacy of St. Peter and his Successors;" "Inerrancy of the Church," which they declare that papists deny; "Infallibility of the Pope," which they also deny; "Transubstantiation," the other supposed "Sacraments," "Invocation of the Saints," "Sacrifice of the Mass," "Confession" to a Priest, "Purgatory," "Relics," etc., etc.

5. An Introduction (of fifty pages) is a somewhat striking feature in the volume. In this the writers display great zeal in advocating the highest style of popery (save, of course, in such things as the "Immaculate Conception" of the Virgin Mary, 1854, and the pope's "infallibility," 1870, the latest additions to the papal creed since their day), and in trying to persuade the reader that their system is not only based on Holy Scripture and antiquity, but is in every respect the truth of God for all mankind. They assert and

reassert, with all their force, that the Romish faith (despite all its additions, alterations, enlargement, etc.) is the only true faith, and that there is no salvation outside the Roman pale. They undertake to *prove*—so they say—by Holy Scripture and the "unanimous consent" of the fathers of the first five centuries, the teaching of Pius Fourth's creed (1564). They state confidently, that "an unbroken chain of *living witnesses*, provided with all necessary *documents*," supports the papal faith, and proclaims its identity with the faith of the Apostles. They further say, that "the promised assistance of the Holy Spirit gives security to their words: I am with you all days, even to the end of the world." A notable instance of how things may be judiciously managed, when in right hands, is furnished by their insinuating that Holy Scripture is of no real value or importance, even in preparing the clergy for their high vocation, and that all which needs to be done is, to follow the *infallible teaching* of popish priests: "Had Christ said, Go and commit to writing the Gospel, or those saving truths, which you have heard from My mouth; and let that writing, or written word, be the rule of belief to those whom you shall instruct, and to their successors, to the end of the world,—had He said this, the point had been clear. But he said it not: He commanded them to *go*, and to *teach*, or *preach*. The commission is, to *teach;* and obedience to that teaching is enjoined under the severest menace." Can anything be more neatly muddled up than that? Do the papists disbelieve that Holy Scripture was written under the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, and is really and truly

the Word of God? Is it possible, that Christian people—so called—with any capability of discriminating between truth and a caricature of truth, can listen to such wild abuse and preposterous claims?

6. These unscrupulous devotees of Rome further try hard to make a point out of St. Paul's language,—"I received" and "I delivered." "He does not say (B. and K. sapiently remark) that he learned the truth from the Scriptures, but that he *received* it. [As there were no New Testament Scriptures—such as we now understand by this designation—in existence and circulation at that time, is it not rather impertinent and unmannerly to fault the pupil of Gamaliel therefor?] And the same truths, by the same mode of teaching by word of mouth, have continued to be delivered down to us, by the pastors of the Church, successors of the Apostles." "The pastors *delivered* what they *received*. To this all are witnesses; all liturgies and other forms of prayer are witnesses, and the writings of all preceding teachers, joined to the admitted testimony of the Scriptures, are witnesses." A number of pages is filled with high praises of the Old Liturgies, such as, that of Jerusalem, the Alexandrian, the Constantinopolitan, the Roman, Syriac, Coptic, etc.; but *why* this bepraising is given to these valuable remains of antiquity, it is not easy to understand, seeing that they afford no help to the Romish cause, and cannot be tortured into supporting the shocking dogma of transubstantiation (a novelty of the twelfth century), and other perversions of the Catholic faith.* The question being

* See Bingham's "Antiquities of the Christian Church," bk.

raised, was the ordinance of *teaching by word of mouth* designed to be perpetual? and if so, "of what use are the Scriptures of the New Testament?" the answer is a singularly audacious one for even a papist: "We conceive these *Scriptures* to be of *no use*, as an independent rule of faith, for this plain reason; that, as all the truths which we believe to be divine, and which are the objects of our faith, come immediately from Christ, and were taught by the Apostles before these Scriptures were written, we are not at liberty to think that these truths would not have remained, to the end of the world, *pure and unaltered*, had that primitive state of things continued; that is, had it never *seemed good* [italics B. and K.'s] to any of the Apostolic men, as it did to St. Luke, to commit to writing what they had learned."

7. Romish assurance has rarely, if ever, exceeded such words as these, and the rebuke thrown out at the Evangelist is in the true "high papal" style! Further, it is reiterated that every popish person "will now be sensible, should any point of his faith seem to receive little support, or even no support, from any text of Scripture, that its truth is not thereby affected, as its divine origin from Christ, and its descent from the Apostles, remain the same." In order to drive the nail home, while they are about it, B. and K. roundly assert, that "A *Guide* is manifestly *necessary*;" "the *teaching authority*, established by Christ, must be esteemed a signal blessing;" "the un-

xv. cap. v. § 4, 5. Also, C. E. Hammond's "Liturgies, Eastern and Western," 8vo, pp. 475, a very useful book for the student.

lettered man, by a few plain documents, is taught that the guides, whom his Saviour has commanded him to follow, can lead him into all truths; and that, in trusting to them, he trusts in God; the *speaking authority* of the Catholic Church [they mean the Romish, of course] can tell me in what sense the Scriptures have, *at all times*, been expounded." Bossuet, the famous French prelate (+ 1704), is quoted, without regard to the context. The "Eagle of Meaux" was a thorough Gallican. He held fast, at all times, to the "four articles," in which are asserted the "liberties" of the French Church, and he spoke, with indignation and amazement, of the famous Bellarmine, the Jesuit, and of his teachings. According to B. and K., Bossuet says, "the written Word of God may be handled and expounded, as fancy shall direct; a word that remains silent under every interpretation. When difficulties and doubts arise, then I must have some external guide that shall solve these difficulties, and satisfy my doubts; and that guide must be unerring." A strange farrago all this! A wonderful discovery, forsooth, that God's Holy Word, written under the guidance of the Holy Ghost, is unfit to be the teacher and companion of those for whom our Saviour suffered on the cross, and that the only help for the members of the Holy Catholic Church is, in submission to whatever absurdity, false doctrine, fiction, or fraud, which popes and priests, for some twelve hundred years, have been pleased to order men to do! It cannot well be termed anything short of insolence for any one to talk and write in this style, inasmuch as nearly the whole of papal claim to be lords and masters, here on

earth, consists of bare assumptions, fables, and platitudes, partly absurd, partly wicked.

8. We take occasion here to warn our readers that Berington and Kirk are guilty of the too common sin of garbling extracts from old writers, leaving out conveniently, without any note of the fact, what does not suit them, and thus perverting the sense of the author. It has been fully proven, by Dr. Barrow, Bishop Phillpotts, Dr. S. F. Jarvis, Dr. J. H. Todd, Robert Southey, and others, that *there is no reliance* to be placed on the honesty or truthfulness of such papists as Berington and Kirk, Milner, O'Connell, and the like. A few words further will suffice about J. Berington and his book. Just let one think in what troubles B. would be involved, were he now alive! *He* says that the pope is *not* "infallible," and that papal definitions or decrees do *not* oblige anybody to "an interior assent." *He* declares "the temporal sovereignty" of the pope does *not* put into his hands any power over princes and states. *He* never heard of the new article in the creed of papists, i.e., the "Immaculate Conception" of the Virgin Mary (1854), so of course could not well say anything about it. *He* also brags, in regard to the points mentioned above, how all this "proves our liberty." Poor Berington! He would have found out, twenty-five to thirty years ago, that he must take it all back again, and do as others do, when the so-called "infallible" Church and its managers see fit to *change* their notions and dogmas about certain articles of their faith. Late writers escape all this, because they live after the Vatican Council and its Decrees (1870) have done their work, and they

must make the best of the state of things as it is. Such teaching as Berington's is, in various matters, out of date, and can never be revived. The terrible anathemas have frightened some, probably not very many. The prospect is anything but pleasant, we judge, to numerous good people in the Romish Church; for the cry is continually heard, the pope *is* infallible, the pope *is* supreme master over every empire, kingdom, nation, and people in the world. "Let no one dare to doubt it!" is the papist's haughty refrain.

9. The next controversial work, to which attention is here asked, is from the pen of Dr. J. Milner, a titular bishop of the Romish Intrusion in England. It is entitled "The End of Controversy" (12mo, pp. 352),* and is highly esteemed among Romanists, having been frequently reprinted. Being a very pretentious volume, it was soon after thoroughly examined and exposed by Dr. R. Grier, an English clergyman of a former generation. His book is out of print; but Dr. S. F. Jarvis, one of the Church's ablest scholars, took the Vicar Apostolic in hand, and published a "Reply to Milner's 'End of Controversy'" (1847, pp. 251). The task was not a pleasant one; yet it was fully ac-

* Full title: "The End of Religious Controversy, in a friendly Correspondence between a Religious Society of Protestants and a Roman Catholic Divine. In three parts: Part I. On the Rule of Faith, or the Method of finding out the True Religion. Part II. On the Characteristics of the True Church. Part III. On rectifying Mistakes concerning the Church. By the Right Rev. John Milner, D.D., Vicar Apostolic, etc. Addressed to the Right Rev. Dr. Burgess, Lord Bishop of St. David's, in answer to his lordship's 'Protestant Catechism.'" The book was first published in 1818.

complished, and we shall take occasion to give our readers the benefit of Dr. Jarvis's help in dealing with Milner's book. This book combines much shrewdness and cunning with a certain show of learning and research. It quietly and unblushingly *assumes*, always and everywhere, that the popish Church in Rome is identical with "the Holy Catholic Church" of the Nicene Creed. It claims, effusively, perfect sincerity, strict adherence to truth, and ardent affection for the souls of those imaginary, guileless people, to whom he professes to be writing letters; but, a careful going through Milner's book compels us to pronounce it to be unscrupulous and unsatisfactory, partly (it may be hoped) from ignorance, and partly from a settled determination to uphold mediæval and modern popery at any cost. In the main, Milner agrees with Berington and Kirk, Charles Butler, Challoner, O'Connell, and others; but, he shows himself to be quite capable of mean and unworthy devices, when his case requires it. He insinuates (though knowing it to be false) that the faith of the Church of England, and of course also that of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States, is *not* that of the Catholic Church at the end of the first four General Councils (A.D. 451), as set forth in the Niceno-Constantinopolitan Creed. Milner and his co-workers put on a bold front, and are daring enough to count as "heretics" and "schismatics," not only the Church of England, but also the Greek and Oriental Churches (who have refused and resisted, for many centuries, all efforts to wheedle or force them into Rome's embraces) and they boast themselves to be *the* one, holy Catholic Church. It is all a piece of

dishonesty and malice. The "triple brass and matchless effrontery" of J. M. cause him to try to fasten what he considers the odious cognomen of "protestant," on all outside of Rome, by telling his readers, who are plain, unlettered people, that Augustine, a great scholar and saint, in the fifth century, reckoned up "ninety *heresies* that had *protested* against the Church" before his day (i.e., the first four centuries or more). The great story-teller goes on to say, that there were fully as many up to the time of Luther's *protest*, and Cardinal Hosius counted two hundred and seventy more sects of *protestants* at the end of the same century. This is a quite easy but very impudent assumption on his part, that papists are the same as the ancient Catholics, in doctrine and worship, before popery was invented, and that all who refuse to accept the Tridentine Creed, with its modern changes and improvements, are nothing less than *heretics*, who properly ought to be burned as quickly as possible. If the subject were not so grave and serious, it would be nothing less than ridiculous to find that there are men, supposed to have some education and some sense of decency, who can indulge in such wicked perversion of plain truth, and such continual, blatant repetition of foundationless things.

10. The titular bishop has a pictorial "Apostolic Tree," at the beginning of his book, in which he shows (as he avers) "the uninterrupted succession" of the Romish Church ("Catholic," he calls it) from the Apostles to the present time, as well as the chief "heretics" of all ages, cut off from her communion. It is quite wonderful in its way, and must please pic-

ture-lovers, who do not know anything of history, or will not take the trouble to inform themselves as to the truth or falsehood of assertions like Milner's. The wily controversialist gives, further on, as an annex to his marvellous tree, some ten pages in small print, containing a synopsis of the history of the popes and their doings during eighteen centuries of Church life and work. It begins with "Simon, the centre of union, and Head Pastor," and ends with Pius VII. in the eighteenth century. Of course, in so small a space, not much can be said or done. He is just a little plagued over the mediæval popes, and their abominable excesses; but Milner is here, as well as elsewhere, equal to the occasion. He glides quite serenely over unpleasant or knotty points, as he means the simple "protestant" folk to do, for whose instruction he professes to write; makes no mention of the fatal year of schism (A.D. 484), when Felix II. issued an anathema against Acacius of Constantinople. and thereby broke off all communion between Eastern and Western Churches; and is wholly silent about the papal schism in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. Certainly, if a man sets out to boast continually of the "absolute and perfect unity" of the Romish Church, all such facts as history records are very troublesome and unpalatable; such, we mean, as there being heresy and schism in Rome itself; the fighting of three popes, one with the other, for a good many years, nobody knowing which was right or true pope, or which was not; the removal to Avignon in France, and desertion of the central and necessary city of popery for some seventy years; the huge corruption and degrada-

tion of the papal court, and those under its control ;— yet, Milner virtually ignores them all, with a saving clause as to the tenth century, which, he says, was "the least enlightened by piety and literature of the whole number," and was also disgraced by "the misconduct of several of the Roman pontiffs." With this slight allusion to there ever being anything wrong in "the mother and mistress of all Churches," the general impression intended to be conveyed is, that the papal monarchy stands out before the world fair and lovely, and free from all just reproach.

11. The Vicar Apostolic makes a fierce assault upon Bishop John Jewell, (one of the bright lights of the Catholic Church in England), and his "Challenge" at St. Paul's Cross London, (1560), to the papists to stand forth in defence of their peculiar dogmas (of which the good bishop gives a list, too long, however, to be here quoted). Milner does not pretend that any Romanist has ever fairly met this challenge. He prefers to call foul names of "hypocrite," "falsifier of the fathers" (applied to Jewell), and coolly tells his readers that Conyers Middleton, the free thinker, and some others, "give up the ancient fathers to the [Romish] Catholics without reserve." A nice, easy way of escape !* He also takes delight as well as pains in giving details of wild enthusiasts, Ranters, Familists, early followers of George Fox, and of John Wes-

* Bishop Whittingham's ably edited and fully annotated edition of Bp. Jewell's "Apology for the Church of England," against the Jesuit Harding's "Confutation," etc., well deserves to be in the hands of all, especially students of history, and seekers after truth and purity.

ley, and the like, quietly and completely ignoring the numerous specimens of not dissimilar performances, at times, in the papist Church, so secure in its infallibility and freedom from all excess. The meanness of this assault upon the members of the true Catholic Church in England and America, as well as on the various Protestant denominations, is equalled only by a sense of utter contempt which is entertained by all decent people for such stuff as papists of a certain stamp dare to put into print.

12. The author of "The End of Controversy" waxes quite eloquent over the name "Catholic," as exclusively belonging to him and his fellows in the Romish Church. He puts on a sort of injured air, and rather groans over the fact that they, who are competent to deal with this matter, uniformly refuse to allow Romish monopoly of truth in claiming to be *the* "One, Catholic, Apostolic Church" of Christ our Lord. He dislikes very much that a good many persons will persist in using what he stigmatizes as "nicknames of Papists, Romanists," etc., though the careless habit of many Protestants, in calling the Romish the Catholic Church, ought to gratify him not a little. Believing it to be a duty always to use accurate language, when dealing with or speaking of others, the reader will note that, in the present volume, we nowhere employ the term "Catholic" for "Romish" or "Papal" Church. Rome's preposterous assertions and claims render it impossible for any true Catholic to yield to them without self-stultification. It is a gross insult, on the part of the pope's adherents, to try to fasten upon the Church of England and her

branches, as well as on the Greek and Oriental Churches, some sectarian title or epithet of reproach. "Are you then men alone, and shall wisdom die with you?" (Job xii. 4). Possibly, wisdom *will* die with the papists; but we shall none the less hold fast to our birth-name of "Catholic," drawn from the Church's creed.

13. In closing what it seems necessary to say, at present, about the titular bishop, and his rather unsavory work, we quote a few strong sentences from Dr. Jarvis's "Reply," and then let him go:—"To correct all Milner's unfair quotations from English writers; to expose his artful attempts to fasten upon the Church of England the recreant conduct of base and degenerate sons; would be an almost endless, and certainly a very unprofitable and loathsome task. I have already shown his *dishonesty*, or his *ignorance*, in the quotations he has pretended to make from the writers of the Early Church. Is not this enough to put the reader upon his guard against his treatment of modern authors?" Bishop Phillpotts, also, in his "Letters to Charles Butler," tells of "Dr. Milner's oft-convicted *insincerity*;" and Robert Southey, in his "Vindiciæ," distinctly charges the Vicar Apostolic with "gross and malicious misrepresentations," and "*fabricating*, with his wonted disregard of truth, false statements."*

* See Dr. Jarvis's "Reply to Milner's End of Controversy," p. 120; Bishop Phillpotts' "Letters to Charles Butler," p. 99; and Southey's "Vindiciæ Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ, comprising Essays on the Romish Religion and Vindicating the Book of the Church," pp. 106–8; 288, 365, 525.

PRELIMINARY.

1. A history of the papacy, in anything like detail, for the last thousand or twelve hundred years, would involve a larger amount of labor than we can, at present, venture upon, and would also require far more space than we have at our command.

2. For all practical purposes, the history of the first five or six hundred years is sufficient to put the intelligent reader and student in possession of the fundamental facts and truths whereby the papal system is to be judged. Leo I. (A.D. 451) may be regarded as planting the seed, out of which grew, in the following six to eight centuries, the vast tree of the papal monarchy, culminating in Gregory VII., Hildebrand, A.D. 1073–1087, and Innocent III., 1198–1218. Boniface VIII., 1294–1303, also talked and acted in the high, mighty papal style. These may be called the most powerful and uplifted of all the tyrants and oppressors, in both Church and State, during those two hundred and more dreary years. We need not here dwell upon the centuries reckoned in history as the Middle Ages and the Dark Ages, i.e., from the latter part of the fifth century to the revival, in measure, of religion in Europe, at the close of the fifteenth century (say, from the fall of the Western Empire to the Discovery of America

(A.D. 476–1492). The darkest period of gloom and depression was about the seventh century. There were some signs of revival in Ireland in the sixth century. It was a state of barbarism, in the tenth century, in Italy and England, while in France and Germany the condition of things in general was better. Scholastic learning flourished in the eleventh and twelfth centuries; but there was, we are told, a relapse in taste, etc., during the two centuries following.

3. The Romish hierarchy, having gotten firm grasp at this time, held fast to its gains, in Church and State, and never lost sight of the one great thing, to be maintained, at all times and in all places, viz., "the royalties of Peter" (so they phrase their pretty euphemism). By this they meant, and will ever mean, the enforcing, everywhere, and over all, the decrees which have been made in order to bring all Christian men and women under their absolute control. Yet, it may properly be noted here, we think, as affording evidence of there being, in the papal Church's career, some spots of light, amid widespread darkness, that the Church of God in Rome, in the fourth and fifth century, was distinguished, as Dr. Bright clearly states it, ("Notes on the Councils," above referred to, p. 53) by "the traditions of an orthodoxy which had hardly, if ever, been sullied, and of a munificent charity which had won the gratitude of poorer brethren in Greece, in Syria and Arabia, and in Cappadocia." Still further, in addition to Leo's noble courage in the matter of the Vandal chief (p. 53), history puts on record that a number of good things were done by popes, during centuries of ignorance and degradation,

to retard downhill progress, and to mitigate, in some degree, the oppression and misrule of rival factions, emperors, kings, etc., on the one hand, and wicked, tyrannous popes and their adherents, on the other.*

4. Under the circumstances, then, we propose to select certain topics, relating to doctrine and practice, which cannot well be passed over in silence, without injustice to intelligent Christian people, and without unfairness in dealing with the Romish system of religion. This system, let it ever be borne in mind, claims to rest on the divine authority of God Himself. Let no one, in search of truth, and resolute to have the truth absolutely and purely, ever allow himself to be put off with plausible assertions and claims and guesses, to fill up inconvenient gaps in testimony. This system, it must never be forgotten, calls them "accursed," all who refuse to accept the monstrous assumptions and falsehoods to which the latest popish gathering in the Vatican (1870) has demanded and pledged the allegiance of papists everywhere. It is quite evident, that there is much dissatisfaction among honest, conscientious, scholarly Romanists, and large unwillingness to receive heartily these latest exhibitions of Jesuit tyranny and power; but, although the secession of "Old Catholic" remonstrants is something, in the right direction, and we hope may grow to be something more, yet it is tolerably plain, that the thoroughgoing papist, with the added weight of new dogmas, and tightening the rope of authority around

* For details, let the reader turn to some good history of this period, such as "Student's Ecclesiastical History," vol. II., Smith's "Student's Gibbon," Hallam's "Middle Ages."

the necks of those who are willing to submit, feels sure that now Rome must *gain* all, or (horrible alternative to him) *lose all.* The masters in charge dare not make any—even the very least—concession. They are pledged to carry out to the full all their claims and pretences; and the Catholic Church has before it the prospect of fighting a battle, in behalf of the Truth and the Catholic Faith, like to that of Armageddon in the Apocalypse (Rev. xvi. 16, etc.).

I. Holy Scripture, the Word of God.

1. It is manifestly proper to give, first of all, careful attention to the Word of God, especially as the popish Church, most strangely and wickedly, has so arranged and settled its teaching as to bring God's Holy Word into neglect and virtual contempt. The makers of the Romish creed are well aware, that they cannot find standing ground for their wilful perversion of Holy Scripture and ancient authors. In the very face of all reliable evidence on the subject, they are daring enough to put forth claims and pretences in behalf of what they assume to be "the Catholic faith," which was taught by our Lord and His Apostles, was substantiated by the written Word of God, and fully expressed in the Catholic symbol, viz., the Niceno-Constantinopolitan creed of the Catholic Church, set forth in the first and second ecumenical councils, held in the years A.D. 325 and A.D. 381. Hence, as all this was done and settled long before the growth of popery proper in the Christian world, there was a great stumbling-block in the way of certain persons eager for a change to their advantage. Rome was the great centre for everything, and men must be taught to know this, as soon as possible. Romish doctors and wise men were consequently compelled to devise a process, by which they shrewdly expected to gain their end. This was, in substance, to put forward a novel

and rather taking device or scheme, whereby, if they succeeded, they could readily manufacture just such a creed as they needed. The *written* Word of God was declared and held to be *insufficient*, lacking in various respects, quite too difficult to be understood, without help. The remedy proposed and adopted was, to add to Holy Scripture, i.e., the *written* Word of God, another helper and guide, which they boldly denominated "the *unwritten* word." It was a truly daring scheme; but no other probably would have met the necessity of the case. God's Word, as received and handed down in the primitive Church, interpreted by the early fathers, by the Catholic creed, by the liturgies, institutions, etc., has almost nothing on which to build up a fabric like the papal monstrosity; but, an "*unwritten* Word of God," equal, in their hands, to God's own precious Book (composed under the inspiration of the Holy Ghost) admitted, and admits, of indefinite expansion, and covered, as well as covers, every dogma and practice which the papist desires, or may hereafter desire.

2. The usual plan adopted (as a sort of justification for refusing to follow the primitive Church, which urged upon its members to read and study the Bible) is to dwell, largely and frequently, upon what the papist writers call the necessity of "teaching by word of mouth," meaning thereby, in fact, to keep everything in the priest's hands and under his control. The Holy Scriptures (with shocking irreverence) are held up as being of themselves so dark, so difficult, so dangerous, so lacking in any real capability of guiding God's people—without the Romish priest—that it is

actually affirmed, by pope Leo XII. (A.D. 1825), "the Holy Scriptures of God (as translated into the vulgar tongue) are *poisonous pastures*," and "if the Sacred Scriptures be everywhere indiscriminately published, *more evil than advantage* will arise thence, on account of the rashness of men." Papists are allowed (we are told) when of *mature years* to read approved translations, duly furnished with "explanatory notes." "The Scriptures alone have *never saved* any one, and are *incapable* of giving salvation;" "though they had never been written (says one audacious controversialist), this end would have been attained," and we should have had life without them. All this too, with language like the following staring him and his fellows in the face:—"Receive with meekness the engrafted word, which is *able to save your souls*" (St. James i. 21); "from a child thou hast known the Holy Scriptures, which are *able to make thee wise unto salvation*" (2 Tim. iii. 15); "these are written that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and that believing ye *might have life* through His Name" (St. John xx. 21).*

3. Evidently, Rome means that her people (if she can succeed in screwing them down to that extent) shall not freely use their intellectual or moral faculties, in obeying even the Lord and Master Himself. *He* says, "Search (or, ye search) the Scriptures, for in them ye think [and truly] that *ye have eternal life*, and these are they which *testify of Me*." (St. John v. 39). The popish priest, on the contrary, following

* See Bishop Phillpotts' "Letters to Charles Butler," pp. 217–21; also note, *ante*, p. 27, as to the Rheims Version.

orders, will allow of no untrammelled reading of God's Word in English. He denounces and stigmatizes "individual, uncontrollable inspiration, as each particular reader or hearer of the Bible understands it," because, according to his notion, it leads necessarily to "error and impiety." He bids you cast to the winds every thought or suggestion of trusting for a moment to what the plain words of God set forth, on peril of losing your soul forever. You must submit yourself, unconditionally, he tells you, to "that authority which the Lord *positively ordained* to be our guide." He does not condescend, to be sure, to inform any one whence this lordly authority is derived: *your* place is to take what the priest gives you, and ask no questions. The Trent Council, it is true, uses these words: "Supernatural revelation, according to the faith of the Universal Church, is contained in *written books, and* in *the unwritten traditions* which, having been received by the Apostles from the mouth of Christ Himself, or having been, as it were, handed down from the Apostles themselves at the dictation of the Holy Spirit, have arrived even unto us."—This is little better than flimsy pretence, in its latter part, and has no evidence whatever in its support. Unwritten tradition, unverified and unverifiable, is made to be of the *same value* as the written Word of God,—an assertion well-nigh to blasphemy. Still further: "Should any point of belief seem to receive little support, or even *no support* from any text of Scripture," your teacher and master quietly but firmly says to you, it matters not: the "unwritten word" of tradition and the papal decrees cover all. The result,

in fine, is, in the emphatic language of Pius Fourth's creed (1564) :—"I admit Holy Scripture according to that sense which Holy Mother Church has held and does hold, to whom it belongs to judge of the true sense and interpretation of the Holy Scriptures." The Vatican Gathering (1870) repeats and enforces this claim, having made all the popes to be "infallible," though it is well known, that individual "infallible holinesses" were, now and then, heretics and fautors of false doctrines, to say nothing of the record of their godless lives.

4. It *does* seem strange and perplexing, this audacity and this defiant attitude towards the Bible, the written and inerrable record of God's dealing with His ancient people, His promises and warnings, His mercy and love in sending our one only Lord and Master to save His people. The pretences and excuses which are offered to justify such a course of instruction and action may, possibly, satisfy, or at least silence, thorough-going unthinking papists ; but they are in reality insulting to intelligent, thoughtful, devout Christians, whether under Rome's dominion or not. Do educated Romanists in England and America, in these days, acquiesce in this state of servitude ? Can it be possible that they read early Church history at all ? If they do read in this direction, can they fail to see that, from the beginning, in Apostolic times, up to the fifth century, Holy Scripture was open and free to all members of Christ's Church, and all were urged to read and study it faithfully ? There was no "infallible interpreter" ever heard of in the primitive Church ; no "supreme judge in controversy" was

ever named. Leo I. (A.D. 450), ambitious though he showed himself to be in behalf of Rome's primacy, writes, in one of his Epistles, much to the point: "it is not lawful to differ, even by one word, from evangelic and apostolic doctrine, or to think otherwise concerning the divine Scriptures than as the blessed Apostles and our fathers learned and taught; even now, when rash and impious questions are agitated, as the devil has stirred up evil men's hearts, the Holy Spirit, through the disciples of truth, has brought them to naught." We refer our readers, in this connection, to Dr. J. H. Todd's "Remarks on the Testimony of the Fathers to the Roman Dogma of Infallibility" (8vo, pp. 180, 1848). Dr. T. presents fully the evidence of Irenæus (second century), Clement of Alexandria and Tertullian (same century), Origen and Rufinus (third century), Cyprian (A.D. 250), Cyril of Jerusalem (fourth century), Basil (374), Augustine (410), Cyril of Alexandria (435), Jerome (early part of fifth century). As the originals are given in full, with O'Connell's English equivalent, the reader (if familiar with ancient languages) will be able to appreciate the force of Dr. Todd's language;—"these quotations are, in every instance, made at *second-hand*, in very loose and inaccurate versions, frequently *garbled*, and unfairly separated from their context, so as to misrepresent their real meaning" (p. 101).

5. Other matters of interest and importance, as properly belonging to the subject in hand, cannot well be passed over in silence. Popish writers (like Ryder and his kind) quite often boast of the scholarship and attainments of their doctors and professors. They bid

us take note how many learned, critical works have been and are being issued by them on portions of Holy Scripture, and the like. Quite true, we may reply; but it is equally true, that nearly all their contributions to knowledge of the Bible are in Latin, or some tongue which plain, moderately educated people cannot read or understand. The question suggest itself at once, why are the papists so careful to exclude everything in the way of *translations of God's Holy Word* for people in general? The reader, we think, can easily guess why, from what has been stated on preceding pages. The Roman managers in the sixteenth century were well aware of, and dreaded, what would be the result, if Holy Scripture were freely and generally placed in the hands of their people. They dared not imitate the course pursued by the primitive Church, and by the Church of England and other branches of the Catholic Church. They know, as well as we do, that there were no weapons so mighty as those furnished by putting forth the Bible, in the vernacular, for all Christians to read and profit by. The Reformers, three centuries and more ago, acted on this conviction, both on the Continent and in England, and their versions of God's Book fell upon lovers of Rome's policy like a lightning and thunder storm. Luther translated the New Testament into German in 1522, and the whole Bible ten years later. The effect produced was marvellous indeed. Translations into Danish, Swedish, Italian, Hungarian, Spanish, were issued between 1524 and 1543. Wyckliffe, the Christian hero, in the latter part of the fourteenth century, began his noble work in England. He translated

from the Vulgate the New Testament, 1374–1384. Tyndale, the martyr, published his version of the New Testament (the first which was made from the original Greek) in 1526.

6. They who were in charge of Romish interests and purposes, at this date, were greatly alarmed. They put off the evil day (to them) as long as they could. It was plain that *something must be done*, or attempted at least, without further delay. England was too valuable towards filling the pope's money-box to allow it to get free from Rome's clutches. Necessity overrides all opposition ; and so, preparation was made, in order to accomplish the hateful, obnoxious task. If papists *must have* Bibles, or at least New Testaments, then of course Rome *must furnish* them, so as to destroy, if possible, the mischief done to the popish pretensions by Wyckliffe's and Tyndale's works, by Coverdale's Bible (1535), the Bishops' Bible (1568), and later, by the Authorized Version (so-called) of the Church of England (1611). The Romish authorities selected for this work several Englishmen, University graduates, residing in Rheims, in Northeastern France, towards the close of the sixteenth century. The result was, what is known as "The New Testament of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ ; translated from the Latin Vulgate ; with Annotations, etc. ; published by the English College at Rheims, A.D., 1582." The other books of the Bible were of less consequence for immediate use ; hence, there was no hurry in regard to them. "The Old Testament (was) first published by the English College at Douay, A.D. 1609 ; with Annotations," etc.

The Douay Bible was thus completed at very nearly the same date as the Authorized or Common Version in England, which has been the comfort and support and joy of English Christians and English-speaking people ever since.

7. In this connection, as illustrating queer anomalies in the history of the popes, it may be noted, that Sixtus V. (+ 1590), a sort of wooden-headed specimen of "infallible" pontiffs, made a laughing-stock of himself by preparing a new edition of the Latin Vulgate. It was filled with gross and ridiculous blunders. Clement VIII., an "infallible" of much the same sort, not liking the ridicule and its effects, caused (in 1592) a hasty revision to be made and printed. *Only* about three thousand variations and blunders in all! * It is proper to state further, in addition, that the Romish managers of affairs hoped, if not expected, that, by the Rheims and Douay Versions, they would recover, in part at least, the ground already lost. To a certain extent they succeeded. They can point to an English translation, such as it is, made especially for their own folk; but they take full precautionary measures against all who are Romanists having even this much, if they can prevent it. Their version is deficient (being a translation of a translation), and is much injured by the "Annotations" supplied, and the barbarous, un-English words and expressions used, quite often; such as, "the pasch and the azymes" (Mark xiv. 1), "the prepuce" (Rom. iv. 1), "what is to

* See Thomas James's curious and instructive little volume, entitled "Bellum Papale" (A.D. 1600), for a full exposure of the matter.

me and to thee?" (John ii. 4), "purge out the old leaven, that you may be a new paste, as you are unleavened. For Christ our pasch," etc. (1 Cor. v. 7), "preordinate" (Acts xiii. 48), and many like. (See note, p. 27.) We, nevertheless, cheerfully admit that the Romish Version has a certain degree of merit. It could not well be otherwise; for the bright life-giving light of God's Holy Word will make its way through every opposing obstacle but that of the atheist and his kin. Nay, more, we are of opinion, that it would be a boon of inestimable value to the poorer, uneducated people in the Romish Church, if they were allowed and exhorted to read freely and to study the Douay Bible, with even all its imperfections.

8. There has been given, in the preceding pages, some useful and valuable matter as to the continual, urgent efforts of popish controversialists to belittle and degrade Holy Scripture, in the esteem of the laity and all pious Christian people. This is done, usually, by exaggerating the supposed fearful dangers of "private judgment," unguided, self-reliant interpretation, the awful risk of daring to read, or hear read, God's own written Word, without the help of the priest, and the help also of the popish creed and anathematizing decrees of the papal Church. The larger part of this abuse of the Bible, translated into English or other modern tongues, is mere declamation as well as exaggeration; for, these men know, that the Church of England and the American Episcopal Church, being branches of the one Catholic Church of Christ, have a definite creed, and carefully prepared books of instruction, as well as a liturgy for daily use. They know

also, though they violate the truth in denying it, that there is no toleration or allowance, much less encouragement, for unlearned, self-conceited, fanatical men or women to set up conventicles, and become leaders in schism and heresy. (See p. 71, 76, 80.) It seems hardly worth while to enlarge further on this topic, at this time. We proceed, therefore, to take up another and kindred subject, which it is highly important for all true believers in the Lord Jesus Christ to study, and by God's grace and help rightly to understand.

II. The One Catholic and Apostolic Church.

1. Quite frequently, in preceding pages, it has been necessary to speak of THE CHURCH, founded by our Lord and Master, taught and established in the true faith by His Apostles, and plainly set forth before the world by these holy men and the ministry ordained by them, after the Ascension of Christ, and after the descent of the Holy Ghost, to be forever with the Church. As it is desirable to have a convenient and accurate definition of what is meant by the word or title, we quote from the nineteenth and twentieth of the "Thirty-Nine Articles of Religion" set forth by the Church of England, in 1562, and also adopted and established by the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States, in 1801. "The visible Church of Christ is a congregation of faithful men (*cœtus fidelium*), in which the pure Word of God is preached, and the Sacraments be duly ministered according to Christ's ordinance in all those things that of necessity are requisite to the same. . . . The Church hath power to decree Rites or Ceremonies, and authority in Controversies of Faith; and yet it is not lawful for the Church to ordain anything that is contrary to God's Word written, neither may it so expound one place of Scripture, that it be repugnant to another. Wherefore, although the Church be a witness and a keeper of Holy Writ, yet as it ought not to decree anything

against the same, so besides the same ought it not to enforce anything to be believed for necessity of salvation."

2. Without attempting to go into details here, we refer our readers to Bishop Pearson's full and clear "Exposition of the Creed." In this very excellent volume is set forth, plainly and distinctly, the necessary and infallible truth as to the Church, viz., that our Lord, by the preaching of the Apostles, did gather unto Himself a Church, consisting of thousands, to which He daily added such as should be saved, and will add to the same unto the end of the world; that, unlike the Church of the Jews, limited to one people and nation, it is by Christ's appointment to be disseminated through all nations, extended to all places, holding all truths necessary to be known, and exacting obedience from all men to the commands of our Lord Jesus Christ; thus fulfilling the Articles of the Church's Creed, that is, "the One Catholic and Apostolic Church." The unity, or "oneness," of the Church, "consists in the fact that all members of the Church are baptized by one baptism into one Spirit; are made partakers of one faith, and one hope of their calling; all have one ever-abiding Head, Jesus Christ, to whom they are united by one Spirit; and all thus become one in their one God and Father. The Church is the living Body of Christ, who eternally lives in her, and eternally fulfils His promise, 'Lo, I am with you all the days, even unto the end of the world'" (St. Matt. xxviii. 20).* "That Church of

* Dr. G. F. Maclear's "Introduction to the Creeds" (pp. 223, 4), an excellent manual for students as well as general readers.

Christ (says the Judicious Hooker), which we properly term His Body mystical, can be but one; neither can that one be sensibly discerned by any man, inasmuch as the parts thereof are some in heaven already with Christ, and the rest that are on earth (albeit their natural persons be visible) we do not discern under this property, whereby they are truly and infallibly of that body." * The Church is called "Catholic," in respect of time, enduring throughout all ages, and in respect of teaching all necessary truth which men ought to believe. It has a Catholic Bible, and a Catholic Gospel. The word "Catholic" does not occur in Holy Scripture, but was adopted into the western creeds in the fourth century. In the Nicene Creed the Church is also designated as "Apostolic" (though the term itself is not thus used in the New Testament), because it is built on the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ Himself being the Chief Corner-stone. It has also the grand *mission* to the world of human beings, as truly as the first Apostles had, and is to carry on perpetual aggressive warfare against human ignorance and human sins, and to comfort and warn and elevate human souls, for His sake who took our nature upon Him, and suffered on the cross in man's behalf.

3. There being no point of dispute between the Romish Church and the Greek and Oriental and other Churches, as to the fact of the existence of that marvellous outcome of our Lord's mercy and goodness,

* "Ecclesiastical Polity," III., i. 2. See also, Bp. Harold Browne's "Exposition of the XXXIX. Articles" (edited by Bp. Williams), pp. 458–89.

viz., the Church of Christ in the world, we shall ask especial attention here to a matter of prime importance to all who profess and call themselves Christians. The papists aver, openly and boldly, that there is no portion of the one Catholic and Apostolic Church outside of their enclosure; and they class all, not under their control, as "heretics and schismatics," i.e., virtually heathen. They also have it plainly written down and understood that these must be punished, just so soon as the way is open for destroying utterly all rebels against popish arrogance and cruelty. It is well known that the Church of England, a good while ago, refused all further obedience to Romish tyranny and extortions. This was a sore trial to pope and Jesuits, who rarely if ever lose sight of the money-chance; but the wise ones among them, after a while, bethought themselves of a shrewd scheme by which they could annoy and vex the sturdy Anglo-Saxon people, even more than ever before. This, after due gestation, was carried out by the papist remnant venturing to assert that the English Church, though she has cast off forever the pope and his hierarchy, has no valid *orders* and ministry. Therefore, as a consequence, she has no *mission* in the world, and cannot have any such mission, until, by yielding to the pretensions of a rather lofty-talking bishop in Italy, she be permitted to return to life again. Such being the case, it becomes in measure obligatory on us, to lay before our readers the precise truth, with reasonable fulness, in regard to the Church of England, and her offspring here in this Great Republic.

4. The Church of England.

This national Church is in somewhat of a peculiar position as regards both the Romish Church, on the one hand, and the numerous Protestant bodies or churches, in Europe and America, on the other. Rome, in profession, holds to the three orders in the ministry, with the pope of course as supreme over all. The Church of England also, from primitive ages, has held that, the original constitution of the Apostolic ministry was that of bishops, priests (or presbyters), and deacons. Hence, when the Anglican Church asserted her independence of Rome, and her determination to arrange and manage her own affairs in her own way, she clung to the old ministry, while Protestant Christians, for the most part, have been and are content with a presbyterian or congregational ministry, in their ecclesiastical provisions for preaching the Gospel. As the Church of England was already, at the time of the Reformation, well supplied with this ministry of bishops and the other two orders as helpers, she had no real difficulty in sweeping out popery and its servants. and in providing for the spiritual needs of the people, by what was then, as always before, esteemed to be the apostolic constitution and order of Christ's Church. The missals and various manuals for public worship were taken in hand, and in great measure purged from Romish abominations, in the way of false doctrine and disgraceful impositions. The Book of Common Prayer was so arranged as to be the comfortable help and guide, which it is, in all holy worship and service. Idolatry, in its manifold and per-

nicious forms, was suppressed and banished. The Word of God, in the vernacular, was provided for all; and the public services and Church interior arrangements were adapted to the sacredness of the place and the worship of God alone. As Rome was well aware of the facts of the case, it became evident that, unless something effective was put into operation, England could well afford to go on her way rejoicing, without caring what the papists might try to accomplish against her.

5. A brief account of the origin and early history of the Church in England is properly called for here. Who it was that first carried the good news of salvation to the Isle of Great Britain is not known with certainty. Some critics hold that the tradition which makes St. Paul to have visited Spain, and then Britain (about A.D. 66), before his martyrdom at Rome (A.D. 68), is well founded and quite credible. Bishop Burgess of Salisbury strongly urged the view (1830) in one of his tracts on the origin of the British Church, that the Great Apostle did actually get so far, in his last missionary journey, as the British Isles. It is undoubtedly possible; but the majority of scholars competent to judge do not accept the tradition as wholly trustworthy. The Gospel, however, there is good reason to believe, was preached in Britain as early as the second century, and the British Church always claimed that it was so and then brought to them. Especially was this shown at the close of the sixth century, when Augustin, sent by pope Gregory I., to convert the Anglo-Saxon conquerors of Britain, worked diligently to bring the Church in England

under Rome's control. At first, and for a time, the Britons rejected the proposal with indignation; but the Anglo-Saxons having embraced Christianity, and Augustin and his successors having made renewed efforts, papal domination was in substance established here, (Council of Whitby, 664), as well as elsewhere, in due time.

6. The Norman conqueror William (1066–1087) was bold and resolute enough to refuse the demands of the popes for money, and kept his gains for the most part to himself. His successors continued to oppress the Saxons, all that they could. Church positions, and Church emoluments, were seized upon, and at the same time, as a political movement, the friendship and countenance of popes were courted. These latter inaugurated the profitable practice of sending their legates, hither and thither, and gathered in rich harvests in the twelfth and following centuries. Details cannot here be gone into. For two hundred years or more, after William First, the hand of the oppressor was grievous. The pope got his full share of course, and the Church's freedom was sadly curtailed. It was distressing to have it so; for, if the national Church had enjoyed her rightful liberty of counsel and action, popery could never have been able to subdue England. The Anglo-Saxon race, though treated tyrannically by the Normans, was much given to resisting imposition, and such claims as the papacy made in its days of pride and power.* His "holi-

* For details, as to the important statute of *præmunire* (Richard II., fourteenth century), *provisors*, *prohibition* against Romish exactions, and the like, see Richard Hart's "Ecclesiastical Rec-

ness, pope Paschal (1099–1118), reproached the Church of England for her independent course and action, in regard to trial of bishops, refusals of appeal to the court of Rome, etc. The Church held councils and synods without notice of or care for the pope, and did numerous like vexatious things; which led him to threaten to "deliver them up to the vengeance of Almighty God, as backsliders from the Catholic Church." Becket, the haughty Archbishop of Canterbury, was murdered in 1170; Henry II. died (1189), and was succeeded by his son, Richard Cœur-de-Lion; John, the poltroon, gave away England, as far as he was able, to pope Innocent (1213), and MAGNA CHARTA was obtained in 1216. Martin V. (1417–1431) talked in the same grandiloquent style with Paschal and others, as to the treatment given to papal bulls in England, to proctors, notaries, executors of my lord the pope's behests, etc. Yet, withal, Rome's grasp was never relaxed to any extent, as time rolled on; for England was too rich a mine for greedy and covetous Italian lackeys of the pope to surrender, except under the stern necessity which soon after overcame them.

7. Henry VIII. (1509–1547), a not very odorous character, it must be confessed, had nevertheless a fair share of English courage. Though he toyed with the pope a good deal, and said various foolish things, yet he did, when roused up to it, considerable service in behalf of the Church of England's right to freedom

ords of England, Ireland, and Scotland, from the Fifth Century to the Reformation" (8vo, pp. 441, 1846), a very valuable book for the student of history and all seekers after truth and right.

from foreign domination. He gave the pope to understand that *he*, Henry, was king of England, and owed no allegiance to the pretended successor of St. Peter, or any one else. Edward VI. (1547–1553), though short-lived, was spared long enough to help on materially the work begun. The reign of unhappy "Bloody Mary" (1553–1558) was grievous indeed to Church and State, especially the former; but, providentially, her time for doing harm was not long protracted, and both Church and people had opportunity to see what was before them, if popery prevailed. Elizabeth, the brave daughter of Anne Boleyn, (so shamelessly slandered, even to this day, by the pope and his helpers), at the fitting age of twenty-five, ascended the throne, and, despite all that was done to thwart and injure her, (even to the crime of assassination), was permitted to have a long and prosperous reign (1558–1603). It was soon discovered that she was not to be cajoled or frightened by the pope and his aiders and abettors. Neither by flattery nor by fraud, neither by insolence nor by savage fulminations from Rome, was "Good Queen Bess" ever moved from her steadfastness. In Church matters she displayed wisdom and sound judgment in selecting Matthew Parker, a godly, well-learned man, to become Archbishop of Canterbury, and to take the lead in ecclesiastical affairs in England. He was duly consecrated at Lambeth, December 17, 1559, by Barlow, late Bath and Wells, then elect of Chichester, then elect of Hereford; Coverdale, late bishop of Exeter, and John Hodgkins, suffragan bishop of Bedford; the august ceremony being performed according to King Ed-

ward's Ordinal. Thus "the Apostolic Succession" was secured for all time to come.* Papists, like Ryder, (p. 60), have a way of affecting to sneer at the Church of England on the ground of being merely a schismatical part and parcel of lordly Rome. And they take so much pleasure in this way of dealing with the subject, that some good people—not much given to thought— are apt to suppose "there must be something in it." In point of fact it needs no more attention, from true Catholics, than does the retaining, even to this day, the anathema against Queen Elizabeth as a bastard, and having no right to the kingdom of England, without the pope's gracious permission! We do not think it likely that anything herein said will disturb the settled papist. He is so bound down to swear to whatever the "infallible" pope and his special body-guard, the Jesuits, say and order, that no argument is of any avail, no presentation of full and complete evidence is of any moment. The priest denounces it all as lies, and nothing else. Knowing this well, we must be content to put into the reader's hands full and overwhelming evidence, and then leave the result to be whatsoever it may.

8. In reference to what was stated, on a previous page, as to the vexation and anger caused to Rome by England's course in Church affairs (p. 88), and the scheme by which papists hoped to disparage and deny the validity of the orders and mission of the national Church, it is hardly necessary to occupy any large

* For a full and lucid setting forth the truth on the subject, see Dr. Samuel Seabury's "Continuity of the Church of England" (8vo, pp. 184). It will well repay examination and study.

space. For more than a generation, be it noted, there was nothing of moment attempted or effected. Romish folk might sneer at the "Protestant Church," as they loved to call it, being truly, however, the reformed, purified Catholic Church, which was resolved to live henceforth as the ancient Churches of primitive times lived; but such a course could not accomplish much towards the end they had in view.* The pope might issue his bulls, might grossly insult the Queen, as he did, and the Jesuits might devise and try to carry out their infamous purposes; but Elizabeth stood firm, and the Church and people for the most part upheld her hands. After nearly half a century had elapsed, the pitiful fable of the "Nag's Head Ordination" was put forth. This ridiculous story was manufactured out of the whole cloth, viz., that Archbishop Parker was consecrated, after a fashion, in a tavern in Cheapside, London! The silliness of such a story, kept so long a time in the dark, and now sent out, is very evident, and no decent papist, with any brains or conscience, has ever been able to swallow it. Yet, strange to say, a Romish bishop, P. R. Kenrick (see p. 23), does undertake, in a volume entitled "The Validity of Anglican Orders Examined"

* See the Rt. Rev. Bishop Coxe's admirable and instructive "Baldwin Lectures for 1886," entitled "Institutes of Christian History" (12mo, pp. 328). Bishop C. goes into details on matters to which we can only briefly allude, in our limited space, such as, "The Apostolical Fathers and Next Ages," "The Middle and Dark Ages," "The Church of our Forefathers," in England, "A Catholic View of Christendom," etc. The reader will do well to secure a copy of this volume, and to delight himself with its contents.

(12mo, pp. 239), to gather up a curious jumble of objections, to argue the point, and to contend that the story is not unlikely to be true. Dr. Lingard, an ardent Romanist, author of the "History of England" from the popish side (Amer. edition, 13 vols, 16mo, 1887, vii. 262) does not hesitate to "pronounce his decision in favor of the consecration" of Archbishop Parker, in due and lawful form. He treats, with well-deserved scorn, "the tale of the foolery supposed to have been played at the Nag's Head;" and avows positively, that "there exists not the semblance of a reason for pronouncing the Lambeth Register a forgery." Let the papist doctors settle it between them, if they can. Such as choose may go on, no doubt will go on, in giving their opinion that, even if Lingard is right, they have the sledge-hammer of "supremacy" and "infallibility" within their reach, whereby the Church of England, and the Catholic Church throughout the world can, ere long, be smashed in pieces, because of spurning the pope's control and usurped dominion.*

9. We give Dr. Jarvis's forcible words, at the close of his chapter on the Church of England, as well deserving attention. "Holding the Catholic Faith,

* It is one of the strange anomalies of our day, that a certain rather select class of men, professedly members of the Church of England, occasionally get down on their knees and say, that they would be "*so* happy," if the pope of Rome would only look into and acknowledge the validity of Anglican orders! His "infallible holiness," however, is too shrewd ever to commit himself on that point; for he knows well, that he gains far more by letting the question alone, and fostering the conceit that *his* opinion is the one chief thing lacking.

'whole and undefiled,' as it was held by the whole Church previous to the fatal year of schism (A.D. 484), and not being subject to the fetters imposed by an ignorant age, how much more exalted is the position of the English Communion than that of the Roman! This the enlightened members of that communion know in their hearts, though their consciences are bound down to slavish obedience by the curses of Trent [and the still more fearful curses of the Vatican, 1870]. I speak advisedly when I say this; for, during my long sojourn in Italy, I had many opportunities of conversing freely with good and learned men, who knew that I would not betray them, and who, like the Israelites in Egypt, 'sighed by reason of the bondage.' Their cry will finally come up unto God, and the Lord of Sabaoth will hear their groaning." (Reply to Milner, p. 137).—In conclusion, it seems proper to state briefly some of the chief efforts made by the papists against the Church of England. As politics are an important factor in the management of affairs in Great Britain and Ireland, and as a considerable portion of the nobility and gentry consists of ardent and active Romanists, bound to sustain the schismatic position and claims of popery, what might be expected has actually taken place. In 1795 there were voted in Parliament £40,000 to build Maynooth papal College, with an annual grant of £8,000. In 1845 the grant was increased to £30,000. In fact, the disposition to favor Rome, as against the Church of England, stands out quite plainly, and is anything but creditable to the English people. In 1850 Pius IX. took the preliminary steps, and in 1851 the pa-

pists were passively allowed to set up in England a new schismatical branch, and to establish an assumed territorial hierarchy. This daring and impudent piece of presumption was and is a grievous insult to the Catholic Church in England. N. Wiseman (1851) assumed the title of "Archbishop of Westminster," which was contrary to law, and was declared by Parliament to be void. The papists boldly asserted that they would not submit to any such laws. W. E. Gladstone had the act of 1851 repealed in 1871, so far as penalties were concerned (£100 for assuming ecclesiastical title, etc.). And finally, in 1869, the Irish Church was disestablished and disendowed, in obedience to Romish clamor, in order to give the papists additional property, etc. The outlook, it must be confessed, is gloomy indeed. What is to be the outcome of all this? Who can tell? Is the national Church of England so cowed down before a haughty Italian prelate, as to allow these encroachments and wrongs to be continued, and finally to end in subjugation once more to impudent popish claims and pretences? God only knows; and we for our part can but supplicate His mercy and goodness, in behalf of the Catholic Church in Queen Victoria's dominions against all foreign intrusion and outrage.

10. The Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States.

The branch of the Church of England in the United States of America, deriving its orders and mission from the parent source, stands securely on the same foundation. Its legal title is as above given. Its

field of work extends from the Atlantic to the Pacific, east and west, and from the British possessions on the north, to Mexico and Central America on the south. As full statistics are easily to be obtained, in Almanacs and other like volumes, we shall not encumber our pages by giving them here. To Americans this Church is sufficiently well known, as is but reasonable. It has now (early in 1896) eighty-one Bishops, and forty-six hundred other clergy. There are fifty-eight dioceses in the United States, eighteen missionary districts, and seven missionary districts in foreign lands. Church edifices for the worship of God, in accordance with the prescribed liturgy and usages, colleges, seminaries, schools, and institutions of various sorts for the aid and comfort of the poor, are numerous and helpful towards carrying forward the Master's work in our highly favored land. Contributions during the year amounted to over $18,500,000.

11. It seems but proper to say here a word or two further, as to the position of religious Denominations and Churches in the United States. Of course, all exist and work, in our country, on a footing of equal rights under its Constitution and Laws. The Romish Church has the same freedom with everybody else to labor in propagation of her tenets. As a body, the Romanists are active, zealous, earnest, diligent, in striving to gather into their fold all whom they are able to reach. They are prudent, too, and circumspect, so as not to give needless offence to their Protestant neighbors, and are fully alive to the importance of judicious care (p. 58) not to bring forward, at all aggressively, the stringent dogmas of Trent and the

Vatican (1870). They are, as the phrase is, "biding their time." They can afford to wait—a thousand years, so they say, if necessary—for the good time coming; and hence, "the mother and mistress of all churches" does not flaunt herself openly and disagreeably in the faces of American Christian people, who are not under her control, but keeps back quietly, out of sight, the demand made in her standards for absolute *submission* to "the infallible head," the supreme ruler and governor over the whole earth; the fixed and undoubted right to chastise "*heretics*" by fire and sword; the making a grand bonfire of all the English Bibles in existence; and such like. Occasionally, some lofty claim or pretence is put forth from Romish pulpits, or by Romish dignitaries; but rarely, if ever, in a way to frighten or rouse the attention of the American people. Just at present, with that easy-going habit of our folks, they not wisely think that they can treat with indifference everything of the kind. Time will show, and when the real conflict comes (if come it must), all we can say now is, "God bless and sustain the right!"

III. The Society of Jesus,

or, as more commonly known,

The Jesuits.

1. We enter upon this topic with considerable reluctance. There is something so offensive in the very word "Jesuit," in its well-understood meaning in our day, something so calculated to make all honest, decent, truth-loving people, whether professedly Christian or not, indignant and angry, that it becomes hard to speak of "the insolent and aggressive faction" (Newman's appellative for his enemies), with any reasonable patience. Were it not that the truth of history must be preserved and vindicated—even though men, who seem largely to be demons from the lowest pit, and their works, are to be put down on record—we should willingly pass by in silence these *hostes humani generis*. Our purpose is to speak plainly, though briefly, of what is truly held to be a foul blot upon the Christian name.

2. The time when this new and potent order arose, and its special adaptedness for the occasion, deserve to be carefully noted. The state and condition of the "papal monarchy," so called, early in the sixteenth century, were such that, from some quarter or other, new life and power must be had, or almost certainly the popedom would ere long sink into insignificance

and ultimate ruin. The pope and his co-workers were naturally much disheartened, almost confounded, by finding that the religious orders in existence had lost, or were losing very generally, their position and influence, and their capability of meeting the crisis apparently now near at hand. Dominicans and Franciscans (whom Southey scores as "the two most mendacious fraternities that the world has ever seen"), Augustinians, Benedictines, Carmelites, Carthusians, Capuchins, Cistercians, Theatines, and all the rest, appeared, more or less, to be about to collapse. Where to turn for efficient help was the pressing, the burning question. Help, however, *did* come, of such a kind as to virtually infuse new life and activity into the pope's claims and pretences of having in his hands universal dominion. The *Jesuits* were the men for the occasion, and may properly be regarded as the saviours and re-founders of the papacy almost everywhere. It is worth noting here, that Rome has already paid rather dearly for all that she got by the coming into power of this new order, the result being that the Jesuits have been for a long time and are now absolute masters; and still more, in God's ordering, retribution to injured and insulted truth will some day be required at guilty Rome's hands.

3. Ignatius Loyola (1491–1556), founder of the Jesuit Society, a soldier by profession and training, applied, in 1538, to the pope for permission to do what he had projected; but he was opposed strongly by cardinals and others. Pope Paul III. saw more clearly than they the great and valuable service which such a society, as indicated, would render, in the existing

condition of affairs, especially against Protestant churches and people, papists of the Gallican and German sort, and other like folks. Accordingly, he gave it formal sanction in September, 1540. Loyola drew up the constitution and laws, which are well worth examining by students—when they can, if ever, get sight of them. The vows for the novitiate, the final vows by coadjutors, and the solemn vows by the professed, with also a solemn vow to the pope, bind the Jesuit to go wherever sent on the service of the pope or in behalf of the general of the Society ("Papa Nero," he is called). Vows of poverty, of absolute, unquestioning obedience, refusal to allow of nuns to be under the Society's rule, were ordered. Educational and mission work was specially marked out, the founders well knowing what a hold they could gain through their diligent work in teaching, particularly among the young. "The Spiritual Exercises" of Loyola are very full, and if studied and acted upon, necessarily influence Jesuits in a marked manner. The new association increased rapidly while Loyola lived. He died in 1556 (beatified, 1607; canonized, 1622), and was succeeded by Laynez, and then by Aquaviva, both being able and unscrupulous men. Jesuitism was introduced into Portugal, France, Germany, the Netherlands, and Poland. In 1615, it had 13,000 members in thirty-two provinces; and in 1749, it had 845 colleges and seminaries, besides numerous missions in Protestant and Pagan countries. In 1873, the number given is, in brief, nearly 10,000 in Europe; missions, in various districts, nearly 18,000; in the United States and Canada, some 2000 or more,

and in foreign lands, about 1500. For the reader's help, let it be noted here, that the SECRETA MONITA, "the Secret Instructions and Rules" of the order, are singularly instructive compositions. A copy of these was accidentally discovered among the confiscated papers of a library of the Jesuits, in Westphalia, about the middle of the seventeenth century. They were translated into English, and published by Bishop Compton of London, in 1669. There is little room for doubt that these are authentic, and reveal to all who peruse them the truth respecting what the Jesuits have been and are doing, and will continue to do. Of course, these indignantly affirm that the Instructions and Rules are false and slanderous. The student and careful reader, however, with the proven facts of history in his hands, as regards Jesuit honesty and truthfulness, will have no great difficulty in estimating their denials for all that denials from that quarter are really worth.*

4. When this new order had well begun to show, by its fruits, what it was, and what it was meant to be, the effect produced was striking indeed. Not only the older religious orders felt the change speedily brought about by Jesuit means, but rulers, kings, men of rank and position, as well as numerous others, were

* Some years ago, a small volume was published in London, entitled "Cases of Conscience; or, Lessons in Morals for the Use of the Laity." By Pascal the Younger (sixth edition, 1853, pp. 207). The writer lays bare, with fearful severity as well as strength, the horrible, wicked, and devilish system of Jesuitism, as seen and known in its teaching, and in its practical daily results. The volume is addressed chiefly to W. E. Gladstone, and through him to English Churchmen and others.

much alarmed and aggravated by this new engine for the advancement of popery, often showing itself regardless of the difference between right and wrong, truth and falsehood. No one felt secure anywhere, or in any matter; and ere long it became the fixed conviction in all quarters, that the Jesuits must be got rid of, or life itself would be intolerable. They were expelled from England, by Queen Elizabeth, and were forbidden to return, under penalty of death; but they surreptitiously got back again in James First's reign. Garnet was put to death for the Gunpowder Plot (1605), and six Jesuits were executed, on charge of conspiracy (1678). The other great powers in Europe followed in much the same course, with not unlike results; and though this pertinacious body manages to force itself, with its special aim, where it is not wanted, the result is substantially the same, throughout the habitable world; they are hated and feared by all peoples and communities,—save in the great Western Republic, which has not yet felt, by bitter experience, what Jesuitism really is and means, and what it is capable of doing.

5. As illustrating, in some degree, Jesuit masterhood in Rome, in these days, it is worth noting briefly, that the popes are directed, by those who have them in charge, to keep up a style of bravado or large talking, as if it were their business to order temporal as well as spiritual matters for Christian peoples and countries. For instance, Pius IX., in January, 1855, declared the laws of Piedmont, which did not suit him or his purposes, to be null and void. In July, 1855, he was very "mad" against Spanish legislative acts,

in allowing public worship for those not papists; he declared these laws *abominable*, as well as totally void. In this same July, he fell foul of certain laws of the kingdom of Sardinia, as not meeting his approval. His supposed "holiness," in December, 1856, pursued a similar course with poor Mexico, in declaring her enactments null and void. This same old master of his "beloved" countries (supposed to belong to him, bodies and souls and everything else) actually undertook, in June, 1862, to scold the Austrian lawmakers for allowing freedom of the press, education, obedience to conscience, religious belief, etc. The like farcical course was pursued (Sept. 1863) against New Granada for permitting freedom of worship, and similar privileges. The present pope, Leo XIII., however, showed more than average common sense, in a late encyclical (1891) by advocating liberty of conscience to a certain extent. Papal Rome has never received so severe a blow, to its intolerable claims and pretensions, as resulted from the fixed determination of the Italian people, some forty years ago, to have a government of their own, with their own ruler, and to put an end forever to priestly and Jesuit domination, inefficiency, and greed, in civil affairs. In July, 1871, Victor Emmanuel marched into Rome, and the ancient city became the capital of unified Italy, and so it has continued ever since. The pope and his bodyguard may fume and frown, and meddle offensively in politics, the cardinals may grumble, the Jesuits may plot; but all, so far as appears, in vain. The old pope has his Vatican palace, with its 4000 rooms, and may use as he pleases his ample revenues, secured to

him and his underlings by the government. But this is *not* what the papal lord and the Jesuits desire at all. The "good, old times" are to be restored (if they can accomplish it), and the days are to return, when popes shall again put their feet on the necks of princes and rulers, and when their slightest word, or even whisper, shall resound throughout the habitable globe. A step in this direction was attempted in 1895, with rather ludicrous and mortifying result to the king of Portugal. The newspapers informed the world that Don Carlos was about to make a friendly visit to Humbert, king of Italy; but the pope was much annoyed thereat. Hence, he sent word to Carlos, forbidding everything of the kind, with a threat of withdrawing the papal nuncio from Lisbon, in case of disobedience. There were some who looked on this conduct of Leo as a piece of impertinence, to say the least, and hope was expressed that Carlos might feel strong enough to refuse obedience. The result, however, was that the poor king submitted to the being snubbed, and staid at home! Suppose the position reversed, would the pope venture to forbid King Humbert's visiting Don Carlos?

6. We are quite well aware that, among the Jesuits, there have been at times scholars of high repute, whose works are still used and relied upon. The names and productions of Petavius, Bellarmine, Viger, Baronius, Pallavicini, Perrone, etc., are still highly thought of, and still appreciated for scholarship, at least. The Jesuits, as a rule, are not at all of the vulgar sort of nuisances and oppressors of humanity. They would not steal good people's spoons, or pick

any one's pocket. Oh, no. It is higher game, and more far-reaching results, which they have been and are after. It happens, now and then, that some obnoxious person (even a pope, if necessary, like poor Ganganelli) must be "put out of the way"—a rather nice euphemism for the assassin's work—and *the deed is done!* Everybody is sure that it was done by Jesuit order; but no one is convicted, no one punished. A troublesome king or high personage has gotten in the way, and must be "put out of the way" of certain other personages; and the assassin's dagger does its work, everybody being confident as to by whose order it is done; but, no one is able to stop such things, and they who command them go on at their will. Notwithstanding all this, there are Jesuits, numbers of them at least, who are among the most cultured and well-informed gentlemen of the day. They are polite, courteous, free spoken, and highly esteemed by many for these and the like qualities. We do not undertake to pronounce judgment upon any man. God alone can see into the hearts of his creatures. We are not at liberty to call any man hypocrite, unless the proofs be clear and overpowering; and therefore we deem it most expedient here to leave the disciples of Loyola in the hands of Him to whom all things are known, being assured that truth and right will ultimately prevail.

7. Nevertheless, it must be confessed that the question as to the Jesuits being honest, sincere, truthful, honorable, in any part of the three hundred and fifty years of life of their society, is one of the very puzzling problems in history. It presents a strange, if

not inexplicable, anomaly. They who wish to study out the matter in full, will find it necessary to go through a goodly number of volumes, which come from the friends and upholders of Jesuitism, as well as from those who detest it, and are doing all in their power to destroy it, root and branch. Some good people, however, say, "O, there are pious, sincere, really religious men, who are Jesuits; we must not condemn all for the faults of a portion." Quite likely this is true, in a sense. The Jesuit managers and masters are not fools, or stupid directors of affairs. They know full well that they must have *some* good men to point to, and claim as part of their system and its results. The names of F. Xavier, J. Bona, L. Bourdaloue, D. Petavius, J. Sirmond, P. Segneri, F. de Sales, and various others, are names of men not unworthy of honor and respect, as servants of the Lord and Master. Yes; let it be admitted that piety may flourish in such a soil, and that there are some (if not many) who are beyond doubt disciples of Incarnate Truth. Yet, note the startling alternative which confronts us. Either these men do not really know what is the precise, settled teaching and work of certain fellow-members of the society, or they are hopelessly blind to facts patent to all men who honestly use their eyes and their brains. We are not called upon to impeach their piety, or their honesty. It is a contradiction, however, on the face of it, that good, pure men could have kept company with Jesuits—as they are commonly esteemed and known—and could have become acquainted with the rules and requirements of the society, without also seeing and knowing the kind

of persons, morally as well as mentally, with whom they were brought into daily contact. "What fellowship hath righteousness with unrighteousness? and what communion hath light with darkness?" (2 Cor. vi. 14).

8. We shall therefore close all that need now be said, with giving a brief account of a true-hearted man, walking in the path of duty, despite the consciousness that he would almost certainly be murdered therefor; also, placing on record what was done by pope Clement XIV. (July, 1773), in behalf of truth and right, and how shamelessly it was undone by pope Pius VII., less than half a century afterward (1814). Ganganelli (Clement XIV.) was one of the few popes who, since the fourth or fifth century, can be termed truly pious, religious men. After long and careful examination of Jesuit rules, professed principles, and practices, and being shocked at the enormities everywhere committed, he determined to put an end, absolutely and forever, to the much-feared, much-hated society of the Jesuits. He accordingly issued a "Brief" to that effect, and made known in full the grounds on which, as an honest Christian man, he must follow the course resolved upon. Ganganelli well knew the risk he was running. The assassin's poison was administered by Jesuit hand, and, though in robust health, in a few weeks he died, his corpse evidencing to all who saw it what a foul murder had been committed. The pope's "Brief" is a very long document, and it is quite impossible to give it here at length. Two or three quotations will suffice at present.

9. "BRIEF FOR THE EFFECTUAL SUPPRESSION OF THE ORDER OF THE JESUITS."

The "infallible" pope pronounces, solemnly and fully, that the Jesuit order is simply infamous, produces discords and wranglings everywhere, and is continually complained of, by appeals and protests, as an intolerable nuisance and disgrace to the Christian name. Previous occupants of the papal chair had favored the society (one, declining to do so, had *died suddenly*) and had tried to reform it; but, to no purpose. Evils grew and multiplied on every hand, and Jesuits were driven out of kingdoms and provinces; and further, the demand was made from all quarters for abolishing and suppressing the godless association.* Pope Clement avers that he did not act hastily, but assured himself of truths and facts not to be disputed. Accordingly—to use his own words—"after mature deliberation, we do, out of our certain knowledge and the fulness of our apostolical power, *suppress and abolish the said Society:* we deprive it of all power of

* We add, for convenience of reference and comparison, a condensed list of the countries, cities, etc., from which the Jesuits have been *expelled*, with indignation and disgust:—from Saragossa, 1555; from Vienna, 1566; from Avignon, 1570; from Portugal, 1578, 1759, 1834; from England, 1579, 1581, 1586, 1602, 1604; from Great Britain and Ireland, 1829; from the whole of France, 1594, also, 1831, 1845; from Holland, 1596; from Japan, 1587, 1613; from Naples, 1622; from China and India, 1623; from Russia, 1723, 1820; from Paraguay, 1733, 1853; from Spain, 1767, 1835; from all Christendom, by Clement XIV., 1773; from Belgium, 1826; from Rheims, 1838; from Switzerland, 1847; from Bavaria, 1848; from Austria, 1848; from Sardinia, 1848; from Sicily, 1860; from the Roman College, and three other houses in Rome, 1872; from the German empire, 1873.

action whatever, of its houses, schools, colleges, hospitals, lands, and in short of every other place whatever, in whatever kingdom or province they may be situated; we abrogate and annul its statutes, rules, customs, decrees, and constitutions, even though confirmed by oath and approved by the Holy See, or otherwise. . . . We declare every authority of all kinds, the general, the provincials, the visitors and other superiors of the said Society, to be forever annulled and extinguished, of what nature soever the said authority may be, whether relating to things spiritual or temporal. . . . Our will and pleasure is, that these our letters shall be *forever and ever and to all eternity valid, permanent and efficacious*, have and obtain their full force and effect; and to be inviolably observed by all and every person whom they may concern, now or hereafter, in any manner whatever."

10. Quite possibly, there were, a hundred years ago, people foolish enough to think that the Christian world was to be freed henceforth from the Jesuits, and that this noted confederation would never be able to recover from the blow received from the "infallible" and supposed master in papal affairs. It did not take long, however, to prove that, though "suppressed forever and ever" by Clement XIV., no such longed-for result was to follow. There were other "infallible" heads coming on in due time, and each one, it was pretty evident, was likely to be wise enough not to offend or oppose the men who had the power of visiting "with sudden death" any and all who did not favor and support them. When "suppressed," in 1773, they were very numerous, a large and well-ap-

pointed army, under military discipline, some twenty-three to twenty-five thousand. They had in their ranks, cardinals, princes, bishops, and the like; with colleges, residences, and seminaries, more than twelve hundred; and they owned property, historians tell us, which, seeing that the confraternity is "vowed to poverty," is a little startling, amounted to £40,000,000 (some $200,000,000). In a quiet but unmistakable manner, the association, "*forever* suppressed and abolished," made popes as well as others understand, that Jesuits were and are a *necessity* to the popish system, and must consequently be restored to their former place. After some forty years of waiting and making due arrangements, an "infallible" was secured to undo the work of a former "infallible." This was Pius VII., and this accommodating personage, not caring (one may well believe) to "die suddenly," by Jesuit machination, restored and gave new life to the Society. This was in 1814. The bull of restoration was shrewdly drawn up. A non-committal policy was adopted. Pius did not say, aye or nay, to what Clement had solemnly and very fully affirmed. And so the terrible arraignment stands forever on the record, and will never be removed. The Jesuits, as a confederation—with their hand against every man (as is commonly believed) and every man's hand consequently against them—are far too wise, after this world's fashion, to be disturbed by anything in pope Clement's "Brief." They *know* that they are too *necessary*, too useful, too capable of inspiring dread if they are opposed, or any attempt is made to get on without them. It is now pretty well understood, in

Rome and out of Rome, that this sworn league is in full command of the situation. The Jesuits are masters now, and tyrannical ones too. They spare none; they are ready to sacrifice all in order to attain their end. Papists of all sorts know this, and are in a dazed condition, not perceiving what to say or do. And still further, the whole Catholic Church is forced to contend with foes by no means easily to be defeated. It is a fight of the Jesuits for life or for death. When the end shall come, and truth be victorious, no mortal man is able to see or conjecture.*

* The number of books, both in defence as well as condemnation of the Jesuits, and their system and practices, is unusually large. Hagenbach ("History of Doctrines," etc., 2 vols. 8vo) gives the titles of some of the best, and thus enables the student to study the question in full. We commend again (see p. 47) Bishop Jewell's admirable "Apology;" also W. Watson's "Important Considerations" (edited by Mendham, 18mo, pp. 140); and "A Glimpse of the Great Secret Society" (London, 8vo, pp. 341, fourth edition, 1873). This volume abounds in instructive and important matter. President Noah Porter's able Essay on "The Educational Systems of the Puritans and Jesuits Compared" (N. York, 18mo, pp. 95, 1851), makes it plain to all what huge danger besets our country and people wherever the Jesuit system of education prevails.

IV. Idolatry of the Church of Rome; Cultus of the Virgin Mary, etc.

1. There is probably no subject about which Romish teachers and guides are more restive and uncomfortable than that of which we now propose to treat. They are ready to put forth all their energies to defend themselves against what is freely and continually charged upon the popish system, viz., *idolatry*. And no wonder; for the assurance of the makers of Rome's creed, in this particular, is beyond anything ever before heard of or imagined. They dare actually to teach and enforce most shocking tenets, and to compel, in fact, papists everywhere to be guilty of an offence against the Lord God, equal to, if not greater and more heinous than, any other named in Holy Scripture. It is, moreover, a gross insult to the Catholic Church throughout the world thus to attempt to force upon Christian people adoption of open idolatry. For idolatry it is, and always will be, to set up a created being, like the mother of our Saviour, as one to be worshipped with (practically) even more honor than God, the Eternal One, Himself; and still more, to assert that the saints are to be prayed to, and their prayers invoked. It would seem, by the words and conduct of such guides, that they hold reasonable, thinking beings virtually in supreme contempt, and are equally ready to show their contempt for God's

Holy Word, and the testimony of God's Holy Church in the first ages. They do, it is true, make a great effort to becloud the subject, and befool men by apparently nice discriminations in regard to the worship of God and certain of His creatures. They write and talk about *latria*, *dulia*, and *hyperdulia*, as if, by use of words out of an unknown language (of which not one in ten thousand knows the meaning and force), they could cover up the real idolatry of their system of devotional teaching and action. Are even the makers and preachers of their creed assured that they know how to pray to God with *latria*, and how to pray to the Blessed Virgin and the saints with *hyperdulia* and *dulia*? Even further, is the abundance of "relics," of all possible sorts, *venerated*, as becomes the obedient priests and people in the Romish Church? And can any one tell us just what *veneration* really means to ordinary people?

2. Nicholas Wiseman, the intruding, popish "archbishop of Westminster," indulges in the following tirade against such persons as charge papists with being guilty of idolatry:—"we are denounced as idolaters, because we pay a certain reverence, and if you please, worship, to the saints of God, and because we honor their outward emblems and representatives. IDOLATERS! Know ye, my Brethren, the import of this name? that it is the most frightful charge that can be laid to the score of any Christian? Then, gracious God, what must it be when flung as an accusation upon those who have been baptized in the name of Christ, who have tasted the sacred gift of His body, etc. Assuredly, they know not what they do who de-

liberately and directly make this enormous charge ; and they have to answer for *misrepresentation*, yea, for *calumny of the blackest dye*, who hesitate not, again and again to repeat, with heartless earnestness and perseverance, this most odious of accusations." Similar outbursts might easily be quoted. The one given, from a popular lecturer, will, however, suffice for the present. It is easy enough for such persons to *deny* that divine honors *are due* to the saints, or their images ; at the same time, papist teachers and others shrewdly keep out of sight the fact that divine honors *are paid* to images of Christ, and to the cross, bits of bones, pieces of handkerchiefs, and the like,—the latter being a very different thing from the former.

3. The Catechism of the Council of Trent* (1564), the authorized manual for papists, under the head of "Prayer" (Part IV. p. 326), uses the following language : after "presenting our respectful and fervent *congratulations* to the Virgin herself" (*ipsi Virgini singularem illam gratulamur felicitatem*), "the Church has wisely added prayers to and invocation of the most holy mother of God, by which we piously and humbly *fly to her patronage*, in order that, by interposing her intercession, she may conciliate the friendship of God to us miserable sinners. . . . Should we not earnestly *beseech* the mother of mercy,

* Full title : "The Catechism of the Council of Trent." Published by command of Pope Pius Fifth. Translated into English by the Rev. J. Donovan, Professor, etc., Royal College, Maynooth (8vo, pp. 413). Dr. Mendham, in his valuable "Memoirs of the Council of Trent" (8vo, pp. 436, 1836), points out Jer. Donovan's perversion of the Latin text (p. 151), as disgraceful to the last degree.

the advocate of the faithful, to pray for us? Should we not earnestly *implore* her help and assistance?" Impious and nefarious is it (we are told), to doubt her "præstantissima merita apud Deum." In the Romish liturgies, missal, and other formularies, prayers to the Virgin and the Saints form a large part. But, some one might naturally ask, *how* does the Virgin *hear* our prayers? Is she now a divine being, and endued with God's attributes of omniscience and omnipresence? The question has never yet been answered; it has always been evaded; and the efforts made to get out of their insuperable difficulties, in the matter, are simply puerile, and take for granted that, the self-confident words of popes and popish councils, so called, are above and beyond any questioning by lay and other people. There is not a single word, or hint even, in the New Testament, or in the Catholic Church's creeds and teaching, that such wicked idolatry was ever thought of, much less practiced, by the disciples of the Lord and Master. In a Catechism issued by a Romish "plenary Council," held in Baltimore (1885), people are directed to "*confess* to blessed Mary, ever Virgin, and to *beseech* her and all the saints to pray to the Lord for them;" also, to get the Church to "apply to us *the superabundant satisfactions* of the blessed Virgin Mary and of the Saints,"—these merits and satisfactions being emphatically the "spiritual treasury" of the popish Church.

4. In his admirable "Letters to Charles Butler," a man of note and character among English Romanists, Bishop Phillpotts goes quite at large into this matter, under the title, "Devotion to the Virgin Mary and

other Saints." Butler had named especially, "Devotion to the Virgin Mary and the Saints, respect to the cross, and the relics of the Saints." In response, Bishop P. makes it evident that the language used, towards the mother of the Lord, is not only extravagant in the highest degree, but is largely and repugnantly blasphemous. A certain "infallible" (not very long since, pope Pius IX., 1854) declared the "immaculate conception of the Virgin Mary" to be a point of faith, and thus made it easy for papists to get over, in part, the unpleasant predicament of elevating a mortal woman, who by her very nature inherited original sin, into a divinity in heaven. Her body, as Romish folk are now taught, was *assumed* or taken up into heaven itself, and the popular style at present is to designate her as "Queen," even as the Lord and Saviour is "King." In one of the offices, these words are used :—

"Mary, Mother of grace, Mother of Mercy,
Do thou protect us from the enemy,
And at the hour of death take us to thyself."

"To thy protection we fly, O holy Mother of God. Despise not our prayers in the time of our necessities; but, from all dangers always deliver us, O Virgin glorious and blessed." "Through thee we hope for pardon of our offences." Dr. Thorndyke, a learned divine of the Church of England, in his "Judgment of the Church of Rome," pointedly remarks :—"to pray to saints departed for those things which only God can give (as all papists do) is, by the proper sense of their words, *downright idolatry*. If they say their meaning is, by a figure, only to desire them to procure

their requests of God, how dare any Christian trust his soul with that Church, which teaches that which must needs be idolatry in all that understand not the figure?" Bishop Mountague (more than two and a half centuries ago), though charged with a strong leaning towards popery, is quoted by Bishop Phillpotts as saying, "simple men invoke saints as they do God; go to their devotions unto the blessed Virgin, not only far more frequently than to Christ Jesus, but without any difference at all go to it downright, as to the authors and originals of the things they desire, having in their power to bestow or not." Though not perhaps impiety, yet "it is flat and egregious foolery at the best."

5. The idolatry of the Romish Church is tolerably evident from what has been already laid before the reader; yet, there are several additional points which cannot properly be passed over in silence. There can be no doubt, in the mind of any unprejudiced observer, as to the extent of this idolatrous worship, in its various forms, throughout the papal enclosure. The cultus of the Virgin is found everywhere, and the number of books, of different sizes and characters, which treat of the "Sacred Heart of Mary," and the like, is to be counted by hundreds and more. A quotation or two are all that we have room for:— "Go, devout client, go to the heart of Jesus, but let your way be *through the heart of Mary;*" the Church wills that, "by no means should Jesus and Mary be separated from each other in our prayers, praises, and affections." "I reverence you, O Sacred Virgin Mary. . . . I bless and praise you infinitely, for

that you are the great Mediatrix between God and man, obtaining for sinners all they can ask and demand of the Blessed Trinity." "*Ave Maria*, Hail, Mary, Lady and Mistress of the World, to whom power has been given both in Heaven and Earth!" Bishop Phillpotts gives five or six pages to what he truly calls "direct and most atrocious blasphemy," and then refuses to soil his book "by producing any more of this disgusting, this polluting trash." A word or two here, however, in this connection, seems fitting to be said. There are those in the true Catholic Church who hold, that due and becoming honor ought ever to be rendered to the name of the "Mother of Jesus," as the chosen one of all the daughters of Eve for the place she truly and rightly filled. As St. John's touching record of the Virgin is, that which tells of our Redeemer, while in agony upon the cross, committing to the keeping of the Apostle His "Mother," so all Christians may and should revere her name and memory, and bless God for His mercy in taking her soul to the rest and peace of Paradise. Indignation at the insults and folly of papists, who strive to make her to be possessed of even divine attributes, need not provoke us to irreverence and vulgarity of various Protestant writers and speakers. Rather, let us adopt good Bishop Pearson's appropriate words: "Far be it from any Christian to derogate from that special privilege granted to her, which is incommunicable to any other. We cannot bear too reverend a regard unto the Mother of our Lord, so long as we give her not that worship which is due unto the Lord Himself. Let us keep the language of the Primitive Church:—

'let her be honored and esteemed, let Him be worshipped and adored.'" (*On the Creed*, p. 262).

6. Books of devotion, so called, (in addition to those already named), are very numerous. One of these, usually termed "Pio Nono's Prayer Book," is from the pen of that somewhat notorious popish controversialist, John Milner, D.D., and is entitled "The Key of Heaven; or, A Manual of Prayer." It is convenient in size, to be carried in the pocket (over 700 pages), and covers quite fully the popular ground of papal devotional literature. Some of this book's teachings may well be quoted here, as showing, in some measure, what is the real doctrine taught to Romish folk. For example: All are commanded to be present at the Great Eucharistic Sacrifice of the Mass; and it is asserted that there is "nothing more sublime, in Heaven and on Earth, than the celebration of the Holy Mass:" the Lord "will, in Holy Mass, renew the Sacrifice of Calvary." Parents are warned not to let their children go to the public schools, attendance at which, it is slanderously said, is at the risk of losing their faith. The Ten Commandments are given after the usual papal style; i.e., the first and a small part of the second are called the first [a cunning mode of keeping out of sight the words of Jehovah Himself in this Second Commandment, since even the least educated Romanist, if he read the words and learned and recited them, could not but be struck with the marvellous difference between the teaching of the Bible and the practice of the popish Church]; the following commandments are of course misnumbered, and the tenth is quietly cut into two portions, so as to

make up the number to ten. At Morning Prayer people must ask, "through the intercession of His [the Lord's] Immaculate Mother," strength, etc. "*Salve, Regina*, Hail, Holy Queen, Mother of Mercy," etc. "Litany of the Blessed Virgin," "deliver us from all danger," etc.; "I commit my soul and body to thy trust," etc. "Rosary for the Blessed Virgin" (twenty pages); "Little Office of the Immaculate Conception" (twenty-one pages). In a small volume entitled "Vest Pocket Gems of Devotion" (two hundred and forty pages) there are forty-five invocations of the Blessed Virgin, in the "Litany of the Virgin Mary;" anthem, "We fly to thy patronage, O holy mother of God; despise not our petitions in our necessities, and deliver us from all dangers, O ever glorious and blessed Virgin," etc. Let this much suffice on this point. It is painful and humiliating to pursue this portion of the subject further at this time.

7. Under the general heading, "Idolatry of the Church of Rome," it seems fitting to give a concise statement of that kind of idolatry known as "the Worship of Images and Relics." The papists are very fierce in denouncing all who charge them with this gross offence against Almighty God (p. 113), and can hardly find words strong enough, in their vocabulary of abusive epithets, wherewith to crush to the earth this foul imputation—as they term it. William Palmer, Worcester College, Oxford, one of the ablest scholars of the Church of England (+1885), whose writings are very valuable, in connection with questions at issue between the Church and the intruding Romish schismatics, wrote a volume of "Letters to N. Wiseman,

D.D., on the Errors of Romanism, in respect to Worship of Saints, Satisfactions, Purgatory, Indulgences, and the Worship of Images and Relics." The learned Oxonian treats the present topic clearly and with sufficient fulness. He undertakes to demonstrate that (notwithstanding all disclaimers on the part of the papists) direct and formal idolatry is authorized and approved in the Romish Church, and that Romanists truly condemn it, according to their principles. He quotes quite at large the usual definitions of popish writers, such as, that "idolatry is the giving to man, or to anything created, that homage, that adoration, and that worship, which God has reserved to Himself." One Romish writer of some note says, there are as many sorts of adoration or worship as there are species of excellence. The nice distinctions made, already referred to (p. 113), as to *latria*, which is due to God only, *dulia*, which is due to created beings, and *hyperdulia*, which is bestowed on the Blessed Virgin, are plainly declared in Romish books, and various high authorities among the papists hold that, by following carefully this astute plan, they can free themselves from every legitimate charge of idolatry. So far as the *theory* goes, it does seem to a good many persons that, as Romanists are not half-witted, or mere children, it would be impossible for them to offer divine worship to stocks and stones, as such, or even to saints and angels, created beings. It is when we come to see and know what is the *practice* of most people in the Roman enclosure, that we find the excuse to be worthless, seeing that the very honor, due to *God alone*, is paid to creatures of God's hand, it

being openly avowed and recommended by eminent teachers and guides. Palmer specifies the following: *Images*, of Christ, of the Trinity, of God the Father; *Relics*, of the blood of Christ, of His nails, His hair, His flesh; of the wood of the true cross, of the nails which fastened Him to it; of the spear, the scourge, the reed, the sponge; of the napkin of Veronica, the linen cloth, and the like; *Images*, of the true cross, of any material; the Blessed Virgin, and her *images* and *relics*. To all these, and a number of others not named in this list, *latria*, or *the honor due to God only*, is formally, expressly, and professedly paid in the Romish Church.

8. Having made this grave charge against the popish leaders and teachers, Palmer proceeds, in the following twenty pages of his learned work, to supply full and undeniable proofs that the charge is true in every respect. He furnishes large references to and quotations from very eminent scholars and theologians in the papal body, such as, Azorius ("Moral Institutes"), P. de Cabrera, Thomas Aquinas, A. de Hales, Bonaventure, Albertus Magnus, and others more recent. Bellarmine, the Jesuit, gives aid in the matter, as do Gretser, Gregory of Valentia, Liguori (in his "Glories of Mary"). Peter Dens, highly esteemed by staunch settled papists, is quoted as setting forth doctrine of peculiar importance in the eyes of high Romanists; such as, that "*images* may be honored with the same worship with which their prototypes are honored," and that "*relics* are to be honored with the same worship with which the person whose relics they are is worshipped." Vasquez also maintains that,

"not even in thought can the image be adored *per se* without the original, separated from it," and he affirms that "the ancient scholastics . . . say absolutely, that the images of Christ and of *the Trinity* are to be worshipped with the adoration of *latria*." The pitiful plea is urged by Trevern, that there is no danger of idolatry amongst Christians, in these days, because Christianity has put an end to everything of the kind. If popish folk "prostrate themselves and bend their knees before images and the like, why, it is only to the *originals*, i.e., to Jesus Christ and the Saints, that this suppliant posture is referred!" The Catechism of the Council of Trent gives full space to "the Honor and Invocation of the Saints." Some nine or ten octavo pages are filled with statements both wicked and absurd; such as, that "the Catholic Church has always paid honor to the bodies and even ashes of the saints;" that "to venerate these sacred relics, these relics and ashes of the saints, tends to the glory of God;" and that the Lord can still work His wonders by the holy ashes, the bones, and other relics of His saints in glory." The writer thereupon bursts forth into admiration at "the wonders wrought at the tombs of the saints, where the blind see, the lame walk, the paralyzed are invigorated, the dead raised to life, and evil demons are expelled from the bodies of men!" Still further, of this strange delusion and imposture it is said, "if the clothes, the kerchiefs, and even the very shadows of the saints, while yet on earth, banished disease and restored health and vigor, who will have the hardihood to deny that God *can* still work the same wonders by the holy ashes, the

bones, and other relics of His saints who are in glory?" "To make and honor the images of our Lord and His holy Mother, and of the saints . . . is a holy practice;" and the Catechism has the audacity to utter this preposterous lie, viz., that all this is vouched for by "the Monuments of the Apostolic age, the General Councils of the Church, and the writings of the fathers!"—Will wonders never cease, in the matter of bold assertions and assumptions, and that, too, in the very face of an entire lack of *facts?*

9. A word or two, in conclusion of this long chapter, as to later and modern miracles. The claim is largely made, that genuine miracles have been and are worked continually, in some form or other. Sometimes, it is "a spring of water," which performs wonderful feats (by special help of the Virgin Mary), vouched for by visitors and others. Sometimes, it is "holy oil" from certain relics; or, "liquefaction of a saint's blood," to cure diseases; or, a "holy coat" (seamless garment of our Saviour's) in the cathedral at Treves, to be revered, as it is by hundreds of thousands of pilgrims. Sometimes, it is a new "image of our Lady" (as at Lisbon), performing marvellous cures. Sometimes, it is "weeping and winking madonnas." Sometimes "a well," as that of St. Winifred, equally famous for curative power. Newman, with his usual facility in sophistication, says: "We (papists) affirm miracles on the earth, ever since the time of the Apostles. It is a first principle." But, "protestants deny" the popish position, and ask for evidence and proof. "Their first principle is, there are no miracles since the Apostles." We deny it, says

Newman, who also avers that "there is in the (Romish) Church a *vast tradition and testimony about miracles.*" "The whole mass of accusations against (Romish) credulity, imposture, pious frauds, hypocrisy, priestcraft," is "protestant assumption," if you choose to credit J. H. N. It is sufficient to repeat our remark, that the Catholic Church calls for proof, genuine, reliable evidence. Believers in popery never furnish any such evidence, but content themselves with sneering or sarcastic observations about other people's stupidity in not "paying religious honor to relics (as the 'holy coat,' etc.) *on the probability*," which satisfies the papist.

10. If the reader please, we will close the present chapter with some words of the learned and highly esteemed Dr. Jarvis :—"In 1828 I went into a church in Turin, where the head of St. John Baptist is venerated, and in 1830 I went into a church in Rome, where also the undoubted head of St. John received equal veneration. 'Are you quite sure, Signore,' said I to my conductor, 'that you have the real head of St. John Baptist?' '*Sicuro!*' with the look and accent of surprise that there could be such a question asked. 'But I was told at Turin,' I rejoined, 'that they had the head of St. John Baptist there.' Nothing daunted, he replied, 'that may very well be, Sir, for it is in the power of God to create two heads!!' . . . In this way are the miracles of the Apostolic age, of which we are assured by the Holy Ghost Himself, brought into doubt, by the lying wonders of credulous and superstitious, if not fraudulent and designing men!"

V. Purgatory, Satisfactions, Indulgences.

1. Purgatory is a curious piece of manufacture, on the part of managers of affairs in the Romish Church. Without any pretence of warrant from Holy Scripture, they found it very convenient, some hundreds of years ago, so to arrange matters that, by means of a place of purgation or cleansing for dead sinners, they could impress living ones with the importance, even the necessity, of paying liberally for the priest's prayers that God would release the deceased from all pains and penalties. This exactly worked in with the comfortable arrangement of "satisfactions," "indulgences," and the like, each and everything of course to be properly paid for. As the creed of Pius Fourth puts it, "I constantly hold that there is a PURGATORY; and that the souls therein detained are helped by the suffrages of the faithful." The Trent Catechism has a good deal to say about "the fire of purgatory, in which" (it is boldly asserted) "the souls of just men are cleansed by a temporary punishment, in order to be admitted into their eternal country, into which nothing defiled entereth."

2. Milner, the popular controversialist (with whom we had somewhat to do, in preceding pages; see pp. 43–48, 119) has no difficulty in declaring that the Scriptures are on his side in this matter, viz., the Second Book of Maccabees, (apocryphal), and such places in

the Canonical Books as throw more or less light upon the state and condition of the dead. Milner skilfully works in references and language about prayers for the departed. The nice distinction, too, between "venial sins," and other sins, is pointed out, and the somewhat famous Unitarian, Priestley, is referred to, as if *his* opinion added value to the teachings of God our Saviour's Holy Catholic Church. This so-called "Vicar Apostolic" also dares to assert that Bishops and others of the Church of England agree with and uphold popish fiction on this subject. Here and elsewhere with Milner and his sort, it is wholly assertion and assumption, and one must take his dogmatic assurance as true, or incur the penalty of anathema at his hands. Berington and Kirk (see pp. 33–43) put, in a single sentence, all they deem it prudent to say about purgatory itself: Papists "hold there is a PURGATORY, that is to say, a place or state, where souls, departing this life, with remission of their sins, as to the guilt or eternal pain, but yet liable to some temporal punishment, still remaining due; or not perfectly freed from the blemish of some defects—which we call venial sins—are purged before their admittance into heaven, where nothing that is defiled can enter." They go on to link this to a proposition following, on "Prayers for the Dead," affirming, as to purgatory, with a sort of grand air of infallibility, "Where this place may be—of what nature or quality the pains be—how long souls may there be detained—in what manner the suffrages, made in their behalf, be applied—whether by way of satisfaction or intercession, etc., are questions superfluous and impertinent, as to faith."

3. The Romish creed makers at Trent (1564) hurl their anathemas against those who hold that "the *whole* punishment is always remitted with the guilt (of sin) by God, and that the *satisfactions* of penitents are nothing but the faith by which they lay hold on Christ's satisfaction for them;" further, "let him be anathema, who holds it to be a fiction that, in virtue of the keys, temporal punishment remains, for the most part, to be discharged after eternal punishment has been removed:" still further, wildly and wickedly it is affirmed, that "it befits the Divine clemency, not to pardon our sins without *satisfaction*, lest we should take occasion to suppose our sins light, and, committing injury and insult against the Holy Ghost, should fall into more grievous sins, laying up for ourselves wrath in the day of wrath:" and even further yet, we are told that, in the Old Testament, there are "instances of temporal calamities inflicted for offences, though pardoned. And this method of temporal pain is *the foundation of our faith* as to Sacramental Satisfaction, Indulgences, Purgatory, and Prayer for the Dead."* The Baltimore Catechism (p. 115) says:— "purgatory is the state in which those suffer for a time who die guilty of venial sins, or without having *satisfied* for the punishment due to their sins," and "an indulgence is the remission, in whole or in part, of the temporal punishment due to sin." A passage in Bishop Phillpotts's "Letters to Butler" (p. 82), is very apposite here. It comes from the pen of a Rom-

* Hornyhold (quoted by Palmer), "Real Principles of (Roman) Catholics," pp. 277, 278.

ish bishop (Fisher), who was put to death by Henry VIII. (1535): "As long as there was no care about purgatory, no one sought for indulgences; for it is on purgatory that all regard for indulgences depends. If you take away purgatory, for what will you want indulgences? We shall not have the smallest need of them, if there be no purgatory. . . . Since then purgatory was so late in being known and received in the Church, can any one wonder respecting indulgences, that there was no use of them in the early ages of the Church?"

4. Plenary and partial indulgences are always at hand for the use of those who seek for them. The *sale* of indulgences was begun by pope Victor II. (1067). Urban II. (1095) followed in suit; and so the disgraceful traffic went on. It was not long before indulgences—even plenary—were to be had on quite reasonable terms. Leo X., early in the sixteenth century, extended this kind of barter; and faculties for liberating souls of the dead from purgatory were sold at a trifling price. Jubilees were established in the fourteenth century, and the pope distributes, after the manner of one who claims to be a god himself, indulgences, remissions, and pardon of all sins: one condition added is significant, viz., "pious prayers to God for the extirpation of heresies and heretics," etc. The pope also (in full use of the divine power blasphemously attributed to him), can grant plenary indulgences out of the treasury of his "satisfactions," —if people pay into the bank the requisite sum. This affords a consoling prospect for the wealthy sinner on his death-bed, and for others who are willing to secure

investment in such purchasable commodities. What a *caricature* on Christianity!

5. Naturally, if not necessarily, a perplexity exists as to whether a "just cause" be requisite, in order that an indulgence may be valid. According to Bellarmine, a Jesuit doctor of high repute, no proportion is demanded between a work enjoined and the indulgence granted; only, as the astute critic remarks, it must of course be a "pious cause," of some sort or other, to call for an indulgence. Others take a somewhat higher view, and hold that there ought to be a fair proportion between punishment remitted and good work performed. Anyway, however, people must remember, with becoming humility, that they have no right to judge in such matters, since their duty is simply to believe that "the apostolic see is always right and just." After the time of the Crusades, when indulgences for *remission of all the sins of warriors* were properly granted, the value of these articles was reckoned very highly. As an illustration, note how the Lateran Council, A.D. 1216, (called "Great," because more than twelve hundred prelates were present) acted. This huge gathering declared, that "all (Roman) Catholics, who, assuming the badge of the cross, should take up arms for *the extermination of heretics*, should enjoy the same indulgence," etc., as the Crusaders. On entirely reliable authority, quoted by Bishop Phillpotts ("Letters," etc., p. 98), we learn that there were things far worse than this, viz., the officials of the pope, not only extorted and squeezed money out of clergy and laity, but, "most base of all, they permitted them, for a certain annual fixed rate

of payment, to live with concubines and harlots!" The *Taxæ Cameræ Apostolicæ* is a production which the student and reader may look into with profit, if he chance ever to meet with it.*

6. The Church of England (as well as her daughter in the United States) expresses the plain judgment of this branch of the Catholic Church, in Article XXII. "The Romish doctrine concerning Purgatory, Pardons, Worshipping and Adoration, as well of Images, as of Relics, and also Invocation of Saints, is a fond thing, vainly invented, and grounded upon no warranty of Scripture, but rather repugnant to the Word of God."—For the benefit of the student, we refer him for full details to Bishop Harold Browne's "Exposition of the XXXIX. Articles," pp. 501–548.

* Mendham quotes the Jesuitic remark of Pallavicini on the subject of Indulgences, "that some good things, on account of preponderating evils, which may be the accidental result, deserve to be abolished. The spoilt trade of Indulgences required no little management. We might have had these good things now, if Luther had not lived!"—"Memoirs of the Council of Trent," Supplement, p. 18.

VI. Romish Transubstantiation: The Catholic Church's Real Presence.

1. In the first ages of the Church it is noticeable that the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, or the Holy Eucharist, was accepted willingly and gladly, as the last precious gift of the Lord to His faithful people. It was never disputed about; though heathen oppressors and enemies reviled, and there was more or less of reticence and avoiding of publicity in administering this holy sacrament, it was received with devout and trustful hearts, and, we may not doubt, accomplished the end had in view by the Gracious Master. When, however, persecution ceased, and Christian emperors occupied the throne, a change ere long began. Philosophy (such as Aristotle's) was in much favor among certain Church teachers and guides. These found time for indulging in speculations, solving abstruse questions, and the like. The great Christian mystery of the Eucharist was diligently searched into, and distinctions introduced of *genus* and *species*, *substance* and *accidents*, and similar subtleties. P. Radbert, in 844, was the first to invent the scholastic doctrine, in its main points, and much discussion followed.* The excellent volume of Ratramn, or Ber-

* Cf. Bishop Harold Browne's "Exposition of the XXXIX. Articles, Historical and Doctrinal" (New York, 8vo, pp. 871). This truly learned and excellent work was edited, with notes,

tram, on this subject appeared about the same time; and in the eleventh century, J. Scott Erigena and Lanfranc took their part in the controversy, Lanfranc introducing the "corporal presence" into England, in the time of William the Conqueror. Following upon this, in the latter part of the twelfth century, Peter of Blois, Archdeacon of London, is commonly credited with inventing and applying the term, *transubstantiation*, to the Eucharist. Hagenbach, however, ("History of Doctrines," II. 95) says that Hildebert of Tours (1180) was the first who made use of this full-sounding epithet; but Bishop Browne gives his opinion that this barbarous word was invented by Stephen, bishop of Augustodunum, about the year 1100. The pope and his helpers saw, as they thought, the way opening for Rome to intervene, and to both claim and gain additional influence and power in Church affairs. Finally, in October, 1551, the Council of Trent, under the anathema curse, denounced every soul who should dare to deny this dogma of transubstantiation.

2. The course pursued by the haughty mistress of the world (as she fancies herself to be), in regard to this marvellous and shocking addition to the Catholic Creed of the Church, is somewhat noteworthy. Arguing on general principles, one would affirm that, if anything is sought to be obtained from others, men will not go about it in an insulting way. They will not mock at people's relying on their sense of touch, or taste, or sight. They will not assume that the ma-

and republished by the Rt. Rev. Bishop Williams, in 1864, for the benefit of American students in theology. The volume is a thesaurus, and well deserves a place in every library.

jority of human beings are idiots, or the like; yet, here we have before our eyes the almost inconceivable spectacle of persons, supposed to be learned and true, propounding a new dogma in religion, which contradicts almost every reasonable faculty God has given to the human race. They take upon themselves lofty airs; *they know*,—and that is enough. They grossly insult those who are certainly fully their equals, in knowledge and understanding, instead of furnishing any, even the least, evidence. The makers of this novelty in religion treat Christian people as if they were half-witted simpletons. They expect that men will stultify themselves by accepting statements, which flatly contradict sight, touch, taste, merely on the ground that *they* (the priests) *say so is so*, and that God's *omnipotence* is equal to any and every emergency. The assurance of these manufacturers of new things is a rather vexatious trial to put up with. Here is a piece of bread and a cup of wine. A Romish priest says (or is supposed to say) certain words, in an unknown tongue, over them, there placed on what they call an "altar;" when, lo and behold, the bread and wine are gone, they affirm; it is now only the "species" or "appearances" of bread and wine, following in this a kind of fantastical philosophy, which, they say, supports their downright untruth. So far as human capability goes, we know and are sure that the bread and wine continue to be bread and wine, as certainly after, as before, the priest's words were uttered. It is little, if at all, short of blasphemy to assert what they do assert; and such assertion and assumption can be received only by simple, ignorant, unreason-

ing beings, who are accustomed to take a Romish priest's word as if it were the very word of the Lord God Himself.

3. If this be not enough to convince and convict gainsayers, the Council of Trent is brought forward, a gathering of ultra devotees of Rome, who apparently rejoiced in bestowing curses on Protestants and Catholics alike. "If any one shall deny that, in the sacrament of the most holy eucharist, is contained truly, really, and substantially, the body and blood, together with the soul and divinity, of our Lord Jesus Christ, and therefore entire Christ; but shall say, that He is in it only as in a sign, or in a figure, or by virtue; let him be *anathema.*" "If any one shall say that, in the most sacred sacrament of the eucharist, the substance of bread and wine remains together with the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ; and shall deny *that* wonderful and singular conversion of the whole substance of bread into the body, and of the whole substance of the wine into the blood, and the *species*, of bread and wine alone remaining; which conversion indeed the (Romish) Catholic Church most aptly calls transubstantiation; let him be *anathema.*" Admitting (as they are forced to do) the lack of evidence and the plain contradiction, yet these men try to get help to their cause by holding up this astounding novelty, as furnishing an admirable illustration of "the complete exercise of the submission of the understanding to Him who gave it and all its powers!" "This is My Body," "This is My Blood," said the Lord, on that memorable night when the sacrament of the Lord's Supper was instituted. Plainly, IS means,

"symbolizes," "represents," or "signifies." It cannot mean, so far as human language has meaning or force, that "is" = "converted into." * Some persons have a summary way of disposing of the matter. Dr. Pusey and his special admirers quote the words, "This *is* My Body," "This *is* My Blood," and then add, with a confident air, "of the laws of a spiritual body I know nothing. One thing I know, that the Truth has said, This *is* My Body. What the Truth has spoken, that for truth I hold." Strange indeed are such words, from such a source, as if they touched at all the point in dispute! One old writer (fifth or sixth century) is quoted as averring a marvel of marvels, "Christ held His own Body in His own hands!" broke it into pieces of course, distributed the portions, and then gave His disciples the Blood in the same style. What are intelligent creatures supposed to be, when dealt with in this wise? The subject is too serious for Christians to dwell upon in the way which popish guides and teachers present it, or we might point out both the absurdity and impossibility of what they gravely and unblushingly set forth; and still more, might hold up to view what infuriated Rome did, when thousands were burned alive, because they could not, and would not, accept Romish fables and deceits.

4. Theodoret, in the fifth century, in one of his Dialogues, teaches the very opposite of the popish dogma of transubstantiation:—"the mystical or sacramental

* See Dr. Mendham's indignant challenge, in the question which he puts:—"In what language, ancient or modern, does IS mean CONVERTED INTO?" (p. 150).

symbols, after consecration, do *not* pass out of their own nature; but remain in the former substance and shape and appearance; and they are seen and touched as they were before. But they are regarded what they are become, and believed so to be. . . . The Lord's Body has become worthy of a seat on the right hand of the Father; it is adored by every creature as being called the natural body of the Lord." In the remainder of the Dialogue, Theodoret presents a very full and instructive collection of "testimonies" to the orthodox doctrine, beginning with Ignatius, and reaching to Athanasius, Ambrose, Basil, Theophilus, Chrysostom, and others. G. S. Faber, in his valuable work on "Christ's Discourse at Capernaum," * says forcibly, "With respect to Scripture, viewed simply and independently, our Lord's Discourse, if we admit the *universal* interpretation of its first part to be correct, is *alone*, by an inevitable consequence from that interpretation, sufficient to demonstrate the utter falsehood of the mere novel and intrusive dogma of transubstantiation." Some excellent words of Archbishop Tillotson's may here be added:—"He that can be brought to contradict or deny his senses is at an end of certainty; for, what can a man be certain of, if he be not certain of what he sees? In some circumstances, our senses may deceive us; but no faculty

* Full title: "Christ's Discourse at Capernaum, Fatal to the Doctrine of Transubstantiation; on the very Principle of Exposition, adopted by the Divines of the Roman Church, and suicidally maintained by Dr. Wiseman; associated with Remarks on Dr. Wiseman's Lectures on the Principal Doctrines and Practices of the (Roman) Catholic Church." By George Stanley Faber, B.D. London, 8vo, pp. 395, 1840.

deceives so little and so seldom : and when our senses do deceive us, even that error is not to be corrected without the help of our senses. Supposing the doctrine of transubstantiation had been delivered in Scripture in the very same words that it is decreed in the Council of Trent ; by what clearer evidence or stronger argument could any man prove to me that such words were in the Bible, than I can prove to him that bread and wine, after consecration, are bread and wine still ? He could but appeal to my eyes to prove such words to be in the Bible ; and, with the same reason and justice, might I appeal to several of his senses, to prove to him, that the bread and wine are bread and wine still."

5. Now, as to the argument about the proper meaning of God's *almighty* power, let us look at it for a few moments. Papists are rather fond of appealing to Jehovah's *omnipotence*, as if that were all-sufficient on which to base their new-fangled dogma. People, who are not in the habit of thinking carefully, are apt to be impressed with this high-sounding pretence. The fact of the case is just this :—not even Almighty God Himself—with reverence be His Name spoken—can work an *impossibility*. The Romish controversialist, with a mixture of pity and contempt for those outside of the papal enclosure, quotes the words, "all things are possible with God," and what more would you have ? Yes, we reply ; all things are possible with God, which are not impossible. The Lord cannot work an absolute *contradiction*. He cannot make a thing *to be*, and *not to be*, at the same instant of time. "It is *impossible* for God to lie," St. Paul

says; He is the God of Truth, absolute and forever. He "*cannot* deny Himself," as the same Apostle declares. Even the Omnipotent *cannot destroy* Himself, and thus proclaim His own weakness and inefficiency. But we need not say more on this point at this time. The pope is "infallible," they tell us, and as he is bound by the same chain which holds his coworkers, he and all of them will repeat, and re-repeat, their unfounded, false claim, and assert, and re-assert, the baseless dogma to which they have sworn allegiance. J. H. Newman (see p. 124), in his artful way of evading difficulties in the Romish Church's teaching, compares the popish transubstantiation dogma with the Scripture doctrine of the Trinity. He cannot, he says, comprehend or understand the latter; why should he be expected to understand the former? Fallacious, as usual. We know actually nothing as to the Divine nature; yet we receive the doctrine of the "Holy, Blessed, and Glorious Trinity, three Persons and One God;" because it has been revealed to God's people in Holy Scripture, and has always been set forth by the Catholic Church in the Catholic Creed. But transubstantiation has not a shadow of claim from Scripture, or the testimony of the Church: it is really an attempt to get gain, although holding up to Romish Christians a positive contradiction and stultification of nearly all man's God-given faculties.

6. Berington and Kirk (see p. 33–43), who profess to confine themselves to the first five centuries—ages before transubstantiation was ever heard of—give, quite profusely, extracts from ancient writers, which (as they say,) support the popish dogma about the

Eucharist. Beginning with the first century, they quote over fifty pages of what they consider proofs, and expect their readers to accept as proofs, of that shocking assumption characterized by that long, middle-aged word, manufactured for it. These astute critics and commentators unblushingly quote from Holy Scripture, after their fashion, as well as from certain fathers, etc. Of course, in their hands, all the places in which "eating the flesh," and "drinking the blood" of the Lord are found, mean what papists *assume* to be their meaning. A French ecclesiastic (close of fifth century) uses such words as these (if we may trust the translation given; see p. 42): "the Jews ate manna; we *Christ.* They the flesh of birds; we *the body of a God.* They the dew of heaven; we *the God of heaven.*" It is useless to waste time over such matter. Even if we were sure, which we never can be with popish controversialists, that the quotations were honestly made, not garbled, or mistranslated, we should not be safe. It is a rather absurd notion they have of quoting a Greek word or two, or even a sentence or two from Greek and Latin writers. It impresses the unlearned, quite possibly; but is of no value as argument. Gelasius (494) also is quoted as saying, "certain sacraments of the body and blood of Christ are something divine, and render us partakers of the divine nature; but the substance or nature of the bread and wine ceases not to be."

7. Romish disputants make much of "the Discipline of the Secret," so called, as if what Cyril, Augustine, Ambrose, Cyprian, and others, are reported to have written, prove that "the mysteries of the

Eucharist are of so awful a nature that the fathers did not hesitate to declare, that it was better to shed their blood than to publish them!" also, that the heathen slanders respecting the Lord's Supper refer to "the dogma of the Real Presence, to the manducation of the Body of Christ." Still further, it is falsely asserted that "all these mysteries, the altar, the oblation of sacrifice, the real presence—by the change of the substance, the adoration, as well as transubstantiation," are taught by the early writers in the third to the fifth century. The "Liturgies," too, are dwelt upon (happily these are within reach of students and all Christians) with large quotations, and if we are ready to take popish advocates' word for it, all teach Romish dogmas in full. The rather remarkable proof of this assumption is the favorite one, still in use, of quoting such words as "the Body of the Lord," "the Blood of the Lord," "the pure Body and Blood of the Lord," "the Very Body and Blood of Christ," and some twenty or more similar expressions, which they have the audacity to affirm do *not* teach the Catholic doctrine, but uphold Rome's novelties instead. We advise our readers to consult Archdeacon Philip Freeman's "Principles of Divine Service" (Vol. II. pp. 55–66).* This able writer points out that Rome teaches the "absolute annihilation of the Eucharistic

* Full title: "The Principles of Divine Service. An Enquiry concerning the true manner of understanding and using the Order for Morning and Evening Prayer, and for the Administration of the Holy Communion in the English Church." By the late Philip Freeman, M.A., Canon and Archdeacon of Exeter. 2 vols. 8vo, 1889. (Vol. I. Morning and Evening Prayer, pp. 435; Vol. II. Holy Communion, pp. 728.)

elements'' (under the name "transubstantiation"); yet, at the same time, she holds that the species, or appearances, of bread and wine, produce the same results of nourishing, etc., the human body as before the priest has succeeded in transubstantiating them. "The animus of the West, from the time of Berengar (eleventh century) down to the sixteenth century, and of a large part now, is to espouse to the utmost the doctrine of *elemental annihilation*, and to press it to its most extreme consequences." Berington and men of his stamp try to befog readers by talking of "the manner of Christ's presence" in the sacrament, and by asserting that "Christ is whole under each species," and that "communion in *one kind* (begun in twelfth century) is just as effective as under both." The Council of Constance (1414) made it a law for papists to communicate in one kind. We quote here, as specially fitting for the reader's help, a part of the Twenty-Eighth Article of the Church of England :— "transubstantiation (or the change of the substance of the Bread and Wine) in the Supper of the Lord cannot be proved by Holy Writ; but is repugnant to the plain words of Scripture, overthroweth the nature of a Sacrament, and hath given occasion to many superstitions." (See Dr. Jarvis's "Reply to Milner," chap. vi. p. 191–98.) Let this suffice.

8. The Real Presence,

As held and taught by the Holy Catholic Church.

Having dwelt somewhat fully on the grievous error of the Romish doctors and formularies, in trying to force

upon Christ's people their unscriptural and false dogma of what is really the *carnal* presence of our Lord in the Eucharist, we gladly turn to the teachings of the Catholic Church on this subject. For all necessary purposes, at the present time, it is sufficient to say, that the Church of England, and the Churches in communion with her, in their standards of doctrine and openly expressed teaching, furnish a clear and satisfactory setting forth of the truth as to our Lord's real, spiritual presence in the Holy Eucharist. We have quoted above a part of the Twenty-Eighth Article; we give now the remaining portion, as expressing in plain language the true Catholic doctrine respecting the Lord's Supper:—"the Supper of the Lord is not only a sign of the love that Christians ought to have among themselves one to another; but rather is a Sacrament of our Redemption by Christ's death; insomuch that to such as rightly, worthily, and with faith, receive the same, the Bread which we break is a partaking of the Body of Christ; and likewise the Cup of Blessing is a partaking of the Blood of Christ. . . . The Body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten, in the Supper, only after an heavenly and spiritual manner. And the mean, whereby the Body of Christ is received and eaten in the Supper, is Faith. The Sacrament of the Lord's Supper was not by Christ's ordinance carried about, lifted up, or worshipped."

9. It is perhaps hardly worth noticing, but Milner's outrageous assumptions, on various points, seemed to have provoked Dr. Jarvis to some extent. In the matter of the Real Presence, Milner has the audacity to

charge the Church of England with trying to cover up and deny that she holds this doctrine in the true sense of the word,—and this, too, when it is patent to everybody, who can read her freely published books of teaching, that such an assertion is simply a wilful falsehood! Dr. J. scores Milner's impudent pretence, that the doctrine of the Real Presence and Transubstantiation is, in meaning, the same thing, the latter being bound upon papists by a dreadful oath. He then goes on to point out what is the Real Presence, as held by the Catholic Church in and from the beginning, viz., that "the Apostolic ministry consecrate the Bread and Wine, and the Holy Spirit makes it, to every penitent and faithful heart, what Christ, at the institution of the Sacrament pronounced it to be, the Body and the Blood of Him who died for the forgiveness of our sins. 'The Cup of blessing which we bless (says St. Paul), is it not the communion (the communication and joint participation) of the Blood of Christ? The Bread which we break, is it not the communion of the Body of Christ?' Hence, Archbishop Cranmer says excellently well:—'although, in the truth of His human nature, Christ be in heaven, and sitteth on the right hand of the Father, yet whosoever eateth of that Bread in the Supper of the Lord, according to Christ's institution and ordinance, is assured of Christ's own promise and testament, that he is a member of His Body, and receiveth the benefits of His passion which He suffered for us on the cross. And likewise, he that drinketh of that holy Cup in that Supper of the Lord, according to Christ's institution, is certified, by Christ's legacy and testament,

that he is made partaker of the Blood of Christ, which was shed for us.' "

10. Let Dr. Jarvis's words be taken (as they fairly deserve to be) as accurately expressing the judgment of the American Episcopal Church. We give also, in behalf of the Catholic Church in England, the forcible language of an eminent prelate (Bishop Phillpotts) respecting the Real Presence. Having stated that "the Real Presence of Christ is in the *soul of the communicant*," he proceeds to give the doctrine of the Church on this subject. "She holds that, after the consecration of the Bread and Wine, they are changed not in their nature but in their *use*; that instead of nourishing our bodies only, they are now instruments by which, when worthily received, God gives to our souls the Body and Blood of Christ to nourish and sustain them; that this is not a fictitious, or imaginary, exhibition of our crucified Redeemer to us, but a real though spiritual one, more real, indeed, because more effectual, than the carnal exhibition and manducation of Him could be, (for the flesh profiteth nothing). . . . It is in this sense that the crucified Jesus is present in the Sacrament of His Supper, not in, or with, the Bread and Wine, nor under their accidents, but in the souls of communicants; not carnally, but effectually and fruitfully, and therefore most really." * The Catechism of the Church teaches

* "On the Insuperable Differences which Separate the Church of England from the Church of Rome: Letters to the late Charles Butler, On the Theological Parts of his Book of the R. C. Church." By Henry Phillpotts, D.D., Lord Bishop of Exeter, 16mo, pp. 334, 1866.

the same truth ;—" The Body and Blood of Christ are verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper ;" and the Office for Holy Communion uses such words as these in prayer,—" Grant us, Gracious Lord, so to eat the flesh of Thy dear Son, Jesus Christ, and to drink His blood, that our sinful bodies may be made clean by His body, and our souls washed through His most precious blood, and that He may evermore dwell in us, and we in Him."

11. Still further: we invite the attention of our readers to some weighty words used by Philip Freeman. He expresses clearly the doctrine of the Church of England, and in terms which cannot but prove serviceable to seekers after truth. " It is difficult, if not impossible, to find in any really ancient Liturgy, or portion of a Liturgy, a single expression which *goes beyond* the recognition of the Elements as the Body and Blood of Christ ; any which identifies them with Christ Himself, much less with the Triune God." . . . " And yet the attempt is made by some in the present day to revive the practice, unheard of until the eleventh or twelfth century, of making an intense act of worship consequent on the consecration of the Elements, and directed towards a peculiar Presence of Christ Himself supposed to be produced thereby. Nay, it is represented (as in the Middle Ages of the West) as one very principal purpose, if not the supreme purpose of the entire Rite, to produce such a Presence as an object for *adoration*. And Christian men are encouraged to resort to the sanctuary, without intending to take any further part in the Rite by communicating." Freeman denounces this, as a novelty at once ground-

less and fatal; as subverting entirely the Apostolic theory of Christian worship, introducing in fact nothing less than *Idolatry*. . . . "It has been abundantly demonstrated that, in the view of antiquity, and of the English Church, the Consecrated Elements are, in a profoundly mysterious, but most true sense, the Body and Blood of Christ; but nevertheless, as not being identified with Christ Himself, nor containing Him personally, are not objects of Divine worship. . . . That Christ is graciously, mysteriously, peculiarly present in the entire Rite, *even as He was at the original Institution*, is indeed to be most firmly held. But of Christ included under the Bread and Wine, as He told us nothing then, so do we know nothing now; and if early writers, and even Liturgies, seem on some few occasions to affirm it, this must be taken as the warm language of devotion, not as the precise utterance of exact theology." (Vol. II. pp. 180, 185, 186.)

12. A few illustrations, chiefly from the ancient fathers, on this topic, before the manufacture of the famous popish dogma, are herewith added. Ignatius, the noble martyr-bishop of Antioch (A.D. 107), says, in one of his Epistles: "I delight not in the food of corruption, nor in the pleasures of this life; I desire the bread of God, which is the Flesh of Christ, and His Blood I desire as drink, which is love incorruptible." In another Epistle, urging the avoidance of schism, he uses such earnest words as these: "Hasten, therefore, to partake of the one Eucharist; for there is but one Flesh of our Lord Jesus Christ, and but one Cup in the unity of His Blood; one altar, one bishop,"

etc. Justin Martyr (A.D. 147), in his Apology to the Emperor, writes thus : "The bread and wine are called by us Eucharist ; which no one is allowed to take, but he who believes our doctrines to be true, and has been baptized in the laver of regeneration, for the remission of sins, and lives as Christ has enjoined. *For we take not these as common bread and common drink.* For like as our Saviour Jesus Christ, having been made flesh by the Word of God, had flesh and blood for our salvation, so we are taught that this food, which is blessed by the power of the word that cometh from Him, by conversion of which our flesh and blood are nourished, is the Flesh and Blood of Him, the Incarnate Jesus." Irenæus, Tertullian, and Clement of Alexandria (in latter part of second century) give testimony to the same effect :—the first is a strong witness against the Romish perversion, believing, as he did, that the Body and Blood are verily and indeed taken in the Eucharist ; Tertullian says, "our body is fed with the Body and Blood of Christ, that our soul may be fattened of God ; and Clement affirms, that "the Blood of the Lord is twofold : the one natural or carnal, whereby we are redeemed from corruption ; the other spiritual, whereby we are anointed ; and this is to drink the Blood of Jesus, to be partakers of the Lord's incorruptibility." Cyprian (middle of third century) in one of his Epistles, is very full on the subject of the Cup in the Sacrament: "whereas Christ says, '*I am the true Vine*,' the Blood of Christ is surely wine, not water [as certain heretics taught]. Nor can it appear that in the Cup is His Blood, with which we are redeemed, if wine be absent, by which

Christ's Blood is represented." Cyprian held firmly to the belief, that there was in the Sacrament a real partaking of Christ, yet considered that there was still remaining the substance of the wine; for, says he, "the blood of Christ is wine," i.e., that Cup which we drink, acknowledging it to be the Blood, is wine. Athanasius, the great theologian of the Early Church (middle of the fourth century), quoting St. John vi. 16–63, observes:—"Christ distinguished between the flesh and the spirit, that, believing not only what was apparent, but also what was invisible, they might know that what He spake was not carnal but spiritual. For, to how many could His Body have sufficed for food, that this might be for nourishment to all the world? But therefore He made mention of His Ascension into heaven, that He might draw them from understanding it corporally; and that they might understand that the Flesh He spoke of, was heavenly food from above, and spiritual nourishment given them by Him." Jerome, Chrysostom, and Augustine (close of fourth century) teach sound Catholic doctrine on this subject, as every student can ascertain by examination of the passages quoted by Bp. Browne from these eminent doctors and pastors. Theodoret, whom we have noted above (p. 136) speaks of the Lord, "who called His own Body food and bread, and again called Himself a Vine: He also honored the visible symbols with the name of His Body and Blood, *not changing the nature, but adding to the nature grace.* . . . The mystic symbols depart not, after consecration, from their own nature, for they remain in the former substance; yet we understand what they

have become, and believe and adore, as though they were what they are believed to be." *

13. Sacrifice of the Mass.

It is scarcely necessary to say much of anything further on this point at present. A few matters, however, require some attention. P. Radbert (ninth century) and others, in following centuries (p. 132), to the Council of Trent (1564), were successful in bringing that gross, modern insult to the Catholic Church into shape, calling it by the now well-known epithet, *transubstantiation*. There it must rest, until Rome repents and amends, or meets with retribution for the mischief and disgrace she has wrought. *The Sacrifice of the Mass*, being a necessary outgrowth of the papal Church's great manufacture just named, needs only small space for its refutation. As the Trent Catechism puts it, this so-called Sacrament was instituted by our Lord at His Last Supper. Record is made, without the slightest evidence or pretence of proof, that an "anathema (was uttered) against all who assert that it is not offered to God a true and proper sacrifice, or that *to offer* means nothing more than that Christ gives Himself to be our spiritual food." The Catechism-maker further says, that, at the Last Supper, the Lord "ordained the Apostles *priests*, and commanded them

* These excerpts are taken from Bishop Browne's "Exposition of the Thirty-Nine Articles" (pp. 692–700). Bishop B. gives the original Greek and Latin of the authors quoted, with exact references to volume, page, etc.,—a practice, by the way, of which popish controversialists do not approve, and which they almost uniformly ignore. (See p. 42.)

and their successors in the ministry *to immolate* and *offer in sacrifice* His precious Body and Blood." "The Sacrifice of the Mass is one and the same sacrifice with that of the cross." "The priest offers this sacrifice in the Person of Christ," and "thus invested with the character of Christ, *he changes the substance* of the bread and wine into the substance of His real Body and Blood."

14. No wonder if, with language of this sort forced upon true Catholics in England, indignation and even disgust found place in their minds and hearts. The English Liturgy had never been soiled by any such wicked perversions. No wonder that the Church was moved to speak, in the plainest terms, of popish corruption of truth, and equally insolent efforts to gain additional power and consequence in England. Article Thirty One deals with the point in this wise: "The offering of Christ once made is that of perfect redemption, propitiation, and satisfaction, for all the sins of the whole world, both original and actual; and there is none other satisfaction for sin, but that alone. Wherefore, the *sacrifices of masses*, in the which it was commonly said, that the priest did offer Christ for the quick and the dead, to have remission of pain or guilt, were *blasphemous fables*, and *dangerous deceits*." For readers and students who wish to inform themselves fully of early Church usage, in speaking of the offering or sacrifice in the Lord's Supper, and also of the frequent employment of the term "altar" (out of which term Romish writers strive vigorously to find support for their hateful dogma), Bishop Browne's excellent volume may properly here be recommended.

15. Although satisfied that, in the preceding pages, are accurately yet briefly set forth the true meaning and import of "the Real Presence" in the Lord's Supper, we are not ignorant of the fact that other and more or less discordant views have been advocated by learned and godly men. The "high," or "advanced," ritualists—so designated—not being contented with what is plainly set down in the Prayer Book, and what has been given from Dr. Jarvis, Bishop Phillpotts, Bishop Browne, and others, have been and are desirous of securing, in the sacrament, acknowledgment of a mode of presence of the Lord which accords better with their minds as well as their feelings. They hold—to use the words of a late American Episcopal divine, Dr. James De Koven—that "the inward part of the Lord's Supper, the Body and Blood of Christ, are mysteriously, spiritually, but really, *united to the bread and wine*, as I believe." This same learned gentleman, at the Episcopal General Convention, in 1871, challenged those who did not accord with his views to a contest, by saying, "I myself adore, and would, if it were necessary, teach my people to adore Christ present on our altars, under the forms of bread and wine." The challenge, (wisely, we think) was declined, in view of all the circumstances. In some of our large cities, "high" ritualists have churches and services arranged according to their notion of the fitness of things. The most "advanced" vocabulary is used, and the Prayer Book language is quite ignored. It is always low, or high, or solemn "mass," "matins," "vespers," "compline," "processionals and recessionals," "hearing of confes-

sions," "acolytes," "assistant crucifer," "censing the altar," with appropriate gorgeous robes, berettas, crucifixes, etc. A good many look with alarm on "high" ritualistic performances, as indicating self-will pretty fully, and foreshadowing grave trouble in the near future. It may be noted, in this connection, that Dr. De K. (above referred to) died in 1879. In May of that year there was a "requiem mass" (of the most approved Romish style) performed in an Episcopal Church in Philadelphia, to the delight of the "advanced" ritualists, and to the pain and vexation of Catholic Churchmen, who believe in obeying the law of the Church, in all respects, and deprecate the disloyal spirit which leads some of the clergy to the imitating or aping popish novelties and fraud.

16. The number of books, large and small, written of late years, and the distinguished bishops and other clergy, who have taken part in this fruitful field of contention, show that there are men of all sorts and degrees, who have something to say, from the highest of the high advocates—as close to Rome as they can get without toppling over into her embrace—down to the baldest Zuinglian "no-presence" folk. If the reader be so inclined, and has time and spirit to go further, we refer him to treatises and discussions on the subject in the Works of Richard Hooker, Jeremy Taylor, and Daniel Waterland, and to the standard volumes of Joseph Bingham on "The Antiquities of the Christian Church;" also, to Archbishop Wake's "Commentary on the Church Catechism," Philip Freeman's "Principles of Divine Service," John Keble's "Eucharistical Adoration," Dean Howson's

"Before the Table"—An Inquiry, Historical and Theological, into the true meaning of the Consecration Rubric in the Communion Service of the Church of England—and Canon George Trevor's "Catholic Doctrine of the Sacrifice and Participation of the Holy Eucharist."

17. Having already exceeded the limits which we had marked out for the present volume, we are compelled reluctantly to omit several topics of interest and moment. We refer especially to "Auricular Confession," and "Celibacy of the Clergy." These form an integral part of the Romish system, and in their practical working show forth some of its most odious results. It is almost impossible to find fitting words by which to describe the horrible, devilish institution of "the confessional," "that cursed tribunal (as one vigorous writer terms it), with a priesthood in deadly hostility to the integrity of every natural human relationship." It is chiefly to be detested, because of its necessary connection with subjects, and matters, which no honest, decent, right-minded woman, no young girl, in her modest simplicity and guilelessness, can listen to, from a Romish priest, without being liable thereby to be most grossly insulted by a foreign man's looks and words. Ryder and his sort say, "the confessional is a court, in which the penitent is accuser and accused, and the confessor judge,"—as if such vague, meaningless words touched the real point at issue! Bishop Browne ("On the Articles," p. 592–596) speaks plainly and forcibly of the systematic and compulsory confessional system of the Romish Church, followed by absolution and penance. The Trent Coun-

cil curses heartily all who deny it to be a "sacrament," and necessary to salvation. For a full and clear setting forth of the subject, see Dr. W. E. Jelf's "Examination into the Doctrine and Practice of Confession" (8vo, pp. 254, 1875). We quote a single passage, as to the great danger and gravity of the crisis now before the true Catholic Church in England: "The confessional is opening in this our hitherto happy country that same source of superstition which has flooded so many papal countries—notably France, Spain, and Italy—with infidelity, even in minds not naturally indisposed to religion, by pressing Christianity on men's homes and hearts in a form deeply repulsive and utterly untrue. Christianity has no greater enemy than the confessional, perhaps none so great. Infidelity has no greater friend, perhaps none so great as the confessional. In its bearing, too, on individual religion its work of demoralization is complete. It dries up the springs of real religion, fills up its wells with rubbish; it paralyzes the energies of individual spirituality, and makes faith nothing more than reason limping in a priest's footsteps, or reluctantly dragged along by a heavy chain—nothing more than reason bowing its neck to the ground and letting a priest put his foot upon it, instead of walking in the knowledge of God, with the uplifted face and the firm, free step of spiritualized, evangelized intelligence."

18. The "Celibacy of the Clergy," while it may be claimed that it has advantages over the Catholic Church's liberty of choice belonging to her priesthood, is a cunning scheme for securing allegiance to Rome

and her creed. Bishop Browne goes quite at large into the subject. He gives both the arguments in favor of celibacy, and the stronger arguments which demonstrate that marriage of the clergy is divinely sanctioned and blessed. As a matter of expediency, it is well no doubt, in various cases, for a clergyman to live a celibate life ; but to make it *compulsory*, in each and every instance, is simply outrageous tyranny. Priests of Rome are but *human* beings after all ! and there is no good reason ever yet given why they should not have the consolation as well as protection of a Christian home, with wife and children. St. Peter had a wife, and she was (history tells us) of much service and comfort to him, in his labors for Christ and the Church. Is any pope or priest, then, rightly to be *compelled* not to have a lawful wife ? and is the utterly disgraceful record of foul, beastly lives of shame and crime to go on and increase year by year ? The writer quoted above says truly, that " the poison of sacerdotal education and *enforced celibacy* is the slow poison which carries foul infection through the veins even of the best, but, in the baser and impure, stealthily rots out all that came in with a mother's milk or blood of Adam, and only leaves the serpent's *virus* to animate a human frame !"—" Shall I not visit for these things ? saith the LORD ; and shall not My soul be avenged on such a nation as this ?"

19. In conclusion, we ask the reader's indulgence for some parting words. It is evident to all, who use their eyes and brains, that there is no system in the world like the papal system. It challenges the entire race of mankind. Its claims have no limitations. Its

aim is to secure absolute and complete despotism over every human being, in body and soul. This was openly avowed by Pius IX. in 1851, in an allocution to his cardinals, wherein he says, "he hath taken this principle for basis, that the [Romish] Catholic Religion, with all its Rights, ought to be exclusively dominant, in such sort that every other worship shall be banished and interdicted." This is the ground too, taken by the Council of Trent, more than three hundred years ago, and has never been disavowed, that the jurisdiction of the papacy reaches to civil officers even though created by imperial or royal authority, and is rightly exercised over cleric or layman, by whatsoever dignity pre-eminent, be he Emperor or King. All persons whatsoever may be punished, and if contumacious, may be smitten with the sword of ANATHEMA. The lovers of right, and the believers in God's Holy Word, and God's truth therein written and interpreted for mankind by God's One Holy Catholic Church, in the Catholic Creed, have no alternative. They must accept the papal monarchy, as it exists, and as it has written itself in the blood of myriads of martyrs, or they must fight the good fight of faith and obedience to God's truth, at any and every cost.

20. Let no one think, for a moment, that this is a light matter. Let not the pious Presbyterian, or Baptist, or Methodist, or the member of any one of the hundreds of Protestant sects, or churches (as they are termed), deceive himself. God's Word, and God's people for first five hundred years, know of only *one true Church* of Christ our Lord. This must be found, and recognized, and honestly obeyed, by all who pro-

fess and call themselves Christians, if it be expected to meet and overcome Rome. The managers of papal affairs are wiser in their generation. They keep out of sight the janglings and discords among themselves; but unite heartily in the resolve to crush out "heretics" and "schismatics" from off the face of the earth. They do not, as yet, avow their full purpose in regard to the work to be done by them in these United States; but, the establishing a new University at Washington, increase in the number of their schools, and colleges, continually getting into the newspapers and meddling with politics, persistent efforts to obtain grants of public money for sectarian uses, and especially to obtain control of and Romanize the Public Schools of the land, show clearly enough that they mean (if they can) to *conquer* this great Republic, and to bring it into *submission* and *subjection* to the Pope and the Jesuits and to the latest creed of Trent and the Vatican. Does it not, then, behoove every one, who values "the *liberty* wherewith Christ has made us free," to bestir himself and watch what the tyrant "papalism" is striving to accomplish here?

21. Would God that the "One Holy Catholic Church" were truly and effectively what she ought to be! Would that she were contending for the true faith, by united effort, under the blessing and support of her Divine Head! If the wretched discords of Christendom, its divisions, its continual denial, in practice, of the Unity of the Church, its lack of faith, zeal, and courage, were removed, and we were, as Christ's people once were, "of one heart and one soul," then indeed we might expect the blessing of

the Lord to rest upon His Church, and schism and heresy, whether popish or otherwise, might be forever driven away.—And finally, as a last word, let every one join heartily in this supplication, from the earliest Anglican Liturgy (1549): "O God the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, our only Saviour, the Prince of Peace: Give us grace seriously to lay to heart the great dangers we are in by our unhappy divisions. Take away all hatred and prejudice, and whatsoever else may hinder us from godly Union and Concord: that, as there is but one Body, and one Spirit, and one Hope of our Calling, one Lord, one Faith, one Baptism, one God and Father of us all, so we may henceforth be all of one heart, and of one soul, united in one holy bond of Truth and Peace, of Faith and Charity, and may with one mind and one mouth glorify Thee; through Jesus Christ our Lord. *Amen.*"

Review and Synopsis of Part II.

Following the plan adopted in regard to Part I., we give here a condensed view of the matters dealt with in Part II. We believe that the reader will find it to be convenient and helpful.

1. Some preliminary remarks as to the history, etc., of the papacy, from the sixth century onward to the Vatican Gathering, 1870 (p. 67, 68). Rome's great alternative, and the prospect before the Catholic Church in the future (p. 69, 70).

2. Holy Scripture, the Word of God, how treated by papists (p. 71, 72). Shocking insolence in attempting to set up an "*unwritten* Word of God," as equal in authority (in fact superior) to the Books of the Bible (p. 72).

3. Insulting language as to Holy Scripture, and "unwritten traditions" (p. 72, 73). Creed of Pope Pius IV. quoted, in regard to the Bible (p. 75). Defiant attitude of popish Church towards Holy Scripture (p. 75).

4. Pope Leo I. quoted (p. 76). Also Dr. Todd's "Testimony of the Fathers" on this subject (p. 76). Romish boasts as to scholarship, etc. (p. 77). Translations hated and feared by papists in power (p. 77). Rheims and Douay Versions made under compulsion (p. 78, 79). Sixtus Fifth's ridiculous Latin Vulgate. Also, Clement VIII. (p. 79).

5. Romish bitterness against "private judgment," etc. (p. 80). Position of Catholic Church in England and America on this subject (p. 80, 81).

6. Definition of "Catholic Church" (p. 82, 83). "Unity" of the Church (p. 83). Authorities quoted (p. 83, 84). Papal arrogance and preposterous claims and pretences (p. 84, 85).

7. The Church of England, position as to Rome, and Protestants generally (p. 86, 87). Outline of Anglican Church history from second century onward (p. 87–95). Romish encroachments (p. 88–91). Resisted successfully (p. 90–92).

8. Archbishop Parker's consecration (p. 90). The popish scheme of denying validity of Anglican orders (p. 91, 92). Lingard quoted: Nag's Head Fable and Lambeth Record (p. 92, 93).

Papist intrusion into England (p. 94, 95). The Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States (p. 95, 96). Position of Religious Organizations in the United States (p. 96, 97).

9. Ignatius Loyola's work (p. 99, 100). *Secreta Monita*, (p. 101). The Jesuit Society, origin and need of (p. 98, 99). The Society a wonderful creation: position and power of the Jesuits (p. 100, 101). Pope's attempt at bravado, etc. (p. 102). Unified Italy (p. 103, 104). Jesuit scholarship, etc. (p. 104, 105). Some good men, etc. (p. 105, 106).

10. Ganganelli's great effort in suppressing the Society (p. 107–109). Apparent success, but real failure (p. 109, 110). Jesuits a *necessity* for Rome's plans and purposes (p. 110, 111).

11. Idolatry of the Church of Rome; Cultus of the Virgin Mary (p. 112–124). *Latria, Dulia, Hyperdulia*, what? (p. 113). Nicholas Wiseman's pompous outburst (p. 113, 114). Trent Catechism quoted, teaches idolatry, etc. (p. 114).

12. Adoration of the Virgin Mary (p. 114). Bp. Phillpotts's Letters to Charles Butler (p. 115, 116). Quotations of worship paid to the Blessed Virgin (p. 116). Thorndyke and Mountague quoted (p. 116, 117). Due reverence proper (p. 118). "Pio Nono's Prayer Book," and other Romish Books of Devotion (p. 119, 120).

13. *Worship* of Images and Relics (p. 120, 121). Palmer's Letters to Wiseman (p. 122, 123). Claim for modern miracles (p. 124). Dr. Jarvis quoted (p. 125).

14. Purgatory, Satisfactions, Indulgences (p. 126–130). Strange perversions, etc. (p. 127–129). Sale of Indulgences (p. 129). Church of England's emphatic language (p. 131).

15. Romish Transubstantiation (p. 132, 133). The Holy Eucharist in primitive times (p. 132). Author of the barbarous Latin term (p. 133). Rome's mode of proceeding an insult to Christians (p. 134). Trent Council, and "anathemas" (p. 135). Pretences as to "is," and its force (p. 135, 136).

16. Dr. Pusey and Co., strange sophistry (p. 136). Theodoret referred to (p. 136). Also, G. S. Faber and Abp. Tillotson (p. 137, 138). Wild perversion as to God's omnipotence (p. 138, 139). Berington and Kirk, and Romish disputants (p. 139, 140). Philip Freeman's valuable work (p. 141). "Elemental annihilation" (p. 142).

17. "The Real Presence" as taught and held by the Catholic Church (p. 142, 143). Church of England's teaching (p. 143).

Milner's impudence (p. 143). Dr. Jarvis's clear statements (p. 143, 144). Also those of Bp. Phillpotts and Philip Freeman (p. 145–147).

18. Illustrations from ancient fathers, Ignatius, Justin Martyr, Irenæus, Cyprian, Athanasius, Chrysostom, etc. (p. 147–150).

19. Sacrifice of the Mass, according to papists (p. 150). Plain language of Anglican and American Churches (p. 151). Larger course of reading recommended (p. 152).

20. Other and discordant views of "high" or "advanced" ritualists in these days (p. 152, 153). What is to be the outcome? (p. 152). Authors and books noted for consultation by students (p. 153).

21. Auricular Confession and Celibacy of the Clergy, and evil results (p. 154–156). Some parting words of warning and encouragement (p. 156, 157). Appeal to Christians for union and concord (p. 157, 158). A Prayer for Peace and Unity (p. 158, 159).

First Four General Councils of the Catholic Church.

1. Council of Nice (Bithynia): Summoned by the Emperor Constantine to meet on Pentecost, June 14, A.D. 325. There were 318 bishops present, with very numerous clergy and laity (perhaps in all some 1500). The Council was occupied specially with crushing out the Arian heresy. The great Athanasius was present, though supposed to be only twenty to twenty three years of age. Twenty canons were adopted, and the session closed on the 25th of July.

2. Council of Constantinople: Summoned by the Emperor Theodosius I., May, 381, purely Eastern, especially for the new capital city. The fathers present numbered 150. Important additions were made to the Creed, i.e., the deity of the Holy Ghost and His procession from the Father, etc. Hence, the Niceno-Constantinopolitan Creed, commonly called the Nicene Creed, is the Faith of the Holy Catholic Church. Seven canons were adopted.

3. Council of Ephesus (Asia Minor): Summoned by the Emperor Theodosius II., June, 431; sat until July 31. About 150 to 160 members present. A conference of members was held later. Finally dissolved in October. Though too noisy, violent, and discreditable, the Council succeeded in condemning the heresy of Nestorius, and passed eight canons. The Latrocinium (or "Robbers' Meeting"), some years later, consisted largely of excited, uncontrollable monks and persons of that sort.

4. Council of Chalcedon (on the Bosporus, opposite Constantinople): Summoned by the Emperor Marcian, October 8, 451; some 500 or more members present, and was in session till November 1. Eutychian mischief, caused by the Latrocinium (449), was dealt with. Thirty canons were adopted, the twenty-eighth being specially noticeable, giving Constantinople (as "New Rome") the second patriarchate (see p. 53).

☞ Let the reader take note that the bishop of Rome was not present at either of these Councils, and had nothing to do with the calling of them, or taking any part of moment in the conclusions arrived at. For meddlesome efforts of Leo I., see pp. 52, 53.

5 and 6. Two subsequent councils are generally accepted as ecumenical, viz., Second of Constantinople, summoned by Em-

peror Justinian, 553, mainly confirmatory of the Councils of Ephesus and Chalcedon; and the Third of Constantinople, held by order of Constantine Pogonatus, 680, which condemned the Monothelites.

The Council of Sardica (344) in Illyria undertook to entrust the bishop of Rome with a certain limited power of receiving appeals. The "Sardican Canons" (third, fourth, fifth, especially) gave impetus to the conceit of the bishop of Rome possessing a kind of power over other bishops. The later popes were not slow to avail themselves of the opportunity thus opened to them by these canons, which Dr. Barrow forcibly characterizes as "the most unhappy that ever were made in the Church."

II. The Great Heresies of Early Church History.

1. *Arian* (so called from Arius, presbyter of Alexandria). It denied the eternal deity of the Son by saying that He was of a *like* or *similar* nature with the Father, not of the *same* nature. The Nicene Council gave its testimony, and insisted on the ὁμοούσια (homoousia), the consubstantiality of the Father and the Son, condemning the ὁμοιούσια (homoiousia). Arius taught that the Lord Jesus was not perfect man in body and soul, but that the Divine Word (λόγος) was in place of the soul. This last was known as the *Apollinarian* heresy.

2. *Nestorian* heresy (so called from Nestorius, bishop of Constantinople). Disliking the term *Theotokos*, or *Deipara* (as applied to our Lord's mother), Nestorius held that the *Man* Christ Jesus could only derive His birth from His earthly parent, thus denying the union of the two natures of God and Man in the Person of Christ. The Council of Ephesus declared that Christ was but one Person, in whom two natures are intimately united, but not confounded.

3. *Eutychian* (or Monophysite) heresy, so called from Eutyches, a presbyter in Constantinople. This was the opposite extreme of the Nestorian, affirming that the divine and human natures of Christ, being originally distinct, became afterwards only *one nature*. The Council of Chalcedon declared the Catholic doctrine to be that, "in Christ two distinct natures are united in One Person, without any change, mixture, or confusion."

III. Chief Fathers and Writers of the First Five Centuries.

(Approximate Date as to when flourishing.)

Apostolic Fathers (to A.D. 100, and beginning of Second Century.)

Clement of Rome	80–90
Ignatius	107
Polycarp	108
Justin Martyr	150
Theophilus	168
Athenagoras	170
Tatian	170
Irenæus	190
Clement of Alexandria	200
Tertullian	210
Origen	235
Cyprian	250
Arnobius	300
Lactantius	310
Eusebius	315
Athanasius	350
Cyril of Jerusalem	360
Epiphanius	370
Basil	374
Gregory Nazienzen	374
Ambrose	385
Chrysostom	398
Jerome	400
Augustine	410
Cyril of Alexandria	425
Theodoret	425
Hilary	425
Vincent of Lerins	434
Socrates	440
Sozomen	440
Prosper	444

INDEX.

A.

Acacius of Constantinople, 46.
Additions to and changes in the popish creed, 37, 38, 41, 42, 45.
Adoration of the Blessed Virgin Mary, 117, 118.
"Advanced," "high" ritualism and ritualists, 56, 152, 153.
Ambrose, quoted, 22, 31, 52, 137, 140.
Anathema (accursed), free use of, 24, 43, 46, 135, 157.
Anglican orders, 90–93. See *Lingard*.
Anglo-Saxon people and spirit, 85, 88, 89.
Antioch, St. Peter bishop of, 16.
Aquaviva, General of Jesuits, 100.
Apostles, "successors" of, 19.
Articles, XXXIX., quoted, 131, 142, 143.
Assumptions, Assertions, etc., easy to be made and abundant, 17, 18, 20, 37–39, 42, 60.
Athanasius, the great theologian, in Rome, how treated, 36; quoted by Theodoret, 137; on the Eucharist, 149.
Augustin, in England, 87, 88.
Augustine, famous Latin father, 31, 45, 76, 140, 149.
Auricular Confession, what it is, 154.
Authorized Version of the Bible (1611), 78.
Avignon, popes in, 46.

B.

Babylon, St. Peter in, 16, 17.
Barrow, Dr. Isaac, great work of, 32; quoted, 26, 31, 32, 42, 53, 59.
Bartholomew, St., Massacre on day of (1572), 61.
Basil, the Great, quoted, 31, 76, 137.
Bellarmine, Jesuit doctor, 41, 104, 122, 130.
Berengar, 54, 142.

Berington and Kirk, "Faith of [R.] Catholics," 33–43; style of controversy, 34–38; great assurance, pretence, garbled extracts, etc., 41–43; on transubstantiation, 139.
Bible, how treated by papists, 71, 72; join tradition, i.e., "unwritten word," to the written Word of God, as being equal in authority, 72; disparage and insult the Bible, 72, 73; wicked words against by Trent and the Vatican, 74, 75; papists taught to hate all translations of God's Word, 77, 78.
Binding and Loosing, 25.
Bingham, Joseph, "Antiquities," etc., referred to, 39, 40, 153.
Boniface VIII., pope, 24, 67.
Bossuet, "Eagle of Meaux," quoted, 41.
Bright, Dr. W., quoted ("First Four General Councils"), 53, 68.
Britain, the Church in, 87.
Browne, Bishop H., excerpts from his valuable work on the XXXIX. Articles, 147–150, 154.
Busenbaum, H., 11.
Butler, Charles, Bp. Phillpotts' Letters to, 49, 115, 116.

C.

"Cases of Conscience," 101.
Catechism of Trent teaches idolatry, 114, 115; on "honor and invocation of saints," 123; sacrifice of the mass, 150.
Catholic Church, the, 82–84; unity in faith and work to be sought, 83, 84; prayer for, 158, 159.
Celibacy of the clergy, 154–156.
Chalcedon, Council of (451), Leo's legates at, 52, 53, 163.
Challoner, [Romish] "Catholic Christian Instructed," 44.
Christendom, sad state of, 158.
Chrysostom, the noble bishop, quoted, 32, 52, 137, 149.
Church Catechism, quoted, 145, 146.
Church of England, true position and rights, 86–97.
Clement, bishop of Rome, 15.
Clement of Alexandria, 76, 148.
Clement VIII., bungling pope, 79.
Clement XIV. See *Ganganelli.*
"Concubines and harlots" allowed, 130, 131.
Confessional, dangers of, 154, 155.
"Confirm," "stablish," meaning of, 27, 28.
Constance, Romish council of (1414), 142.

Constantinople, see of, Dr. Bright's remarks on, 53; councils held in, 163.
Cook, Canon, quoted, 17.
Councils, the Four General or Ecumenical, 163.
Coverdale's Bible, 78.
Coxe, Bishop A. C., "Institutes of Christian History," 92.
Cranmer, Abp., quoted, 144.
Cultus of the Virgin. See *Mary, Saint.*
Cusanus, Cardinal, quoted, 26.
Cyprian, martyr-bishop, quoted, 31, 32, 36, 51, 76, 140, 148.
Cyril of Alexandria, 32, 52, 76, 140.
Cyril of Jerusalem, 76.

D.

Dark Ages, 67, 68.
Decretals of popes, forged, 11, 61.
Denominations or churches, rights of, under laws of United States, 96.
DeKoven, Dr. J., views of, 152; "requiem mass" for, 153.
Dens, Peter, 11, 123.
Devotion, Books of Romish, 119, 120.
"Discipline of the Secret," 140, 141.
Dogmas of Trent and the Vatican, 10, 11, 23–25, 42, 69, 74, 96, 133, 135.
Dominicans and Franciscans, Southey's verdict, 99.
Donation of Constantine, forged, 11, 61.
Douay Bible (1609), 78, 79.
Dulia, what? 113, 121.

E.

Edward VI., reign of and progress of affairs, 90.
"Elements" of bread and wine in the Lord's Supper, 144, 145.
England, Church of, 86–95; national church, by whom founded, 87, 88; papist schemes against, 89, 92; Articles of quoted, 131, 142, 143.
Ephesus, Council of (431), 163.
Epiphanius of Cyprus, referred to, 35.
Eucharist, Holy, discordant views of the day respecting, 152.
Eusebius, the historian, 35.
Evil motives not imputed, 10.

F.

Faber, G. S., on claim of pope Victor I., 51; on transubstantiation, 137.
Facts and truths sought for, 10.
Fathers, early, testimony of, 31, 32; quoted, as to primitive doctrine of the Lord's Supper or Holy Eucharist, 147–150.
Fault-finding by Berington and Kirk, impertinent, 39, 40.
Felix II. and fatal year of schism (484), 46.
Fisher, bishop, quoted, 128, 129.
Forgeries, popish, 11.
Freeman, Philip, on popish and on Catholic teaching as to the Holy Eucharist, 141, 142, 146, 147, 153.

G.

Ganganelli, pope Clement XIV., murdered, 107. See *Jesuits*.
Gelasius II., pope (1118), quoted, 140.
Gladstone, W. E., quoted, 12, 25, 95.
Gospel texts, claimed by papists, fully examined, 21–32.
Greek and Oriental Churches, 44, 45.
Great papal schism (1378–1417), 46.
Gregory I. (pope), 52, 87.
Grier, Dr. R., exposure of Milner, 43.
"Guide (i.e., popish) necessary," 40.

H.

Hagenbach, referred to, 111, 133.
Hammond, C. E., Liturgies, Eastern and Western, 40.
Hart, Richard, "Ecclesiastical Records" referred to, 88.
"Head of the Church," the Lord appointed none, 20.
Headship and supremacy claimed for St. Peter, 19, 20.
Henry VIII. (England), 89, 90.
Heretics, 11; to be exterminated, 10, 45, 53, 85, 97, 130; great heresies and heretics of early ages, 168.
Hildebert of Tours, 133.
Hosius, Cardinal, referred to, 45.
Howson, Dean, "Before the Table," referred to, 153.
Huguenots, slaughtered, 61.
Humbert, king of Italy, and the pope, 104.
Hyperdulia, what? 113, 121.

I.

Idolatry of Church of Rome, patent to all men, 112, 113; attempted befooling people by distinctions, etc., 113.
Ignatius, on the Eucharist, 147.
Images and relics worshipped, 120–122.
Immaculate Conception of the Virgin Mary (1854), 37, 42.
Infallible interpreter, 75.
Infallible teaching, 38; useless, 41; Dr. Todd's statement, 76.
Inquisition, murders by the, 58, 61.
Invocation of saints, 123.
Irenæus, 35; on the Eucharist, 148.
"Is," pretence as to meaning of, 136.
Italy, and her course, 103; king and kingdom of, hateful to pope and Jesuits, 103; "unified" Italy, 103, 104.

J.

James, Thomas, "Bellum Papale," 79.
Jarvis, Dr. S. F., "Reply to Milner," 43; forcible words of, 93; experience as to two heads of John Baptist, 125; on the Real Presence, 144.
Jelf, Dr. R. W., on Confessional, its dangers, etc., 154.
Jerome, referred to, as to St. Peter being in Rome, 18, 28; on the Eucharist, 149.
Jesuits, Society of, when founded, 98, 99; opportune time, 99; rapid increase causes alarm, 101, 102; training and skill, 104; as to honesty, being good men, etc., 106; made away with pope Clement XIV., 107; suppressed by pope C., 1773; resurrected by Pius VII., 1814, 107–110; expelled by all nations and peoples (except United States of America), 108; Brief for their suppression, 108, 109; wealth and power, 109, 110; too *necessary* to Rome to be dispensed with, 110; who can see the end as yet? 111; books well worth consulting, 111.
Jewell, Bishop, challenge to papists, 47; Apology for the Church of England, 47.
Jews, an active, busy race, 13, 14.
John, St., no "successor," 19.
John the Baptist, St., two heads of, 125.
Julius, bishop of Rome, conduct of towards Athanasius, 36.
Justin Martyr, referred to, 35; on the Eucharist, 148.

K.

Keble, John, on "Eucharistical Adoration," 153.
Kenrick, P. R., on *petra*, i.e., (as he held) St. Peter's "confession of faith," 23; assault on Anglican Church orders, 92, 93.
Keys, Power of the, 25, 26.

L.

Lambeth Register, 93.
Lanfranc (eleventh century), 133.
Lateran Council (1216), work of, 130.
Latria, Dulia, Hyperdulia, what? 113, 121.
Latria (honor due to God) given to relics, etc., 122.
Laynez, Jesuit general, 100.
Leo I. bishop of Rome, character and efforts, 52, 53, 67; extravagant words of, 53; services to the people of Rome, 53; on value of Scripture doctrine, 76; Leo's legates, 52.
Leo X., pope, course of, 129.
Leo XII., slanders vernacular translations of the Bible, 78.
Leo XIII., and liberty of conscience, 103.
Lightfoot, Bishop, quoted, 15.
Liguori, A., "Glories of Mary," etc., 11, 123.
Lingard, the Romish historian, upholds the validity of Anglican orders, 93.
Linus, bishop of Rome, 15.
Littledale, Dr., determined foe of popery, 56.
Liturgies, Ancient, 39, 40.
"Lovest thou Me?" 28–32.
Loyola, Ignatius, founder of the Jesuits, 99, 100.
Luke, St., Berington and Kirk's impudent fling at, 40.
Luther, Martin, translation of the Bible, 77.
Lying and lies, 56, 57, 58, 61, 144.

M.

Magna Charta, 89.
"Manducation," 141.
Manning, H. E., "temporal sovereignty of popes," 25.
Martyrdom of St. Peter and St. Paul, 18.
Mary, St., the Virgin, worshipped, 115–118; "superabundant satisfactions" of, 115; cultus of, found everywhere, 117, 118; fit reverence due to, 118.

Mary ("bloody Mary"), queen, 90.
Mass, sacrifice of, what it means, 150, 151.
Maynooth, popish college, grant to, 94.
Mediæval Ages and Church, 34, 46, 55, 61, 67.
Mendham, Dr. J., referred to, and quoted, 111, 114, 131, 136.
Middle Ages and Dark Ages, 67.
Milner, John, Romish controversialist, character and work of, 43, 44; "triple brass and effrontery" of, 45; assault on Bp. Jewell, 47; dishonesty and ignorance, 49; on indulgences, satisfactions, etc., 126, 129; scored by Dr. Jarvis, 144.
Miracles, modern, affirmed to be abundant in Romish Church, 124, 125.
Mountague, Bp., quoted, as to idolatry in Church of Rome, 117.
Murder, when allowable, 58.

N.

Nag's Head, pretended ordination, 92.
Newman, John Henry, pervert to Rome (1845), remarks on his career, books, etc., 54; appellative for Jesuits, 55; on development of doctrine, 55; on lying, 58; on Romish miracles, 124; specious fallacy, as to "Protestant assumption," 125.
Nicene Creed, 44, 71.
Nice, Council of (325), 163.

O.

"Old Catholics" movement, 69.
Omnipotence of Almighty God, what it *is*, and what it is *not*, 138, 139.
Origen, quoted, 35, 36, 76.

P.

Pallavicini, quoted, 131.
Palmer, William, "Letters to N. Wiseman," on Romish errors, etc., 120; on idolatry largely practised, 120–125.
Papal intrusion into England, 94, 95.
Papal court, corruption of, 46.
Papal monarchy and tyrants, 25, 34; papal monarchy, 56, 67, 72, 98.
Parker, Archbishop of Canterbury, 90.
Paschal and Martin V., "high talk," 89.
Paul, St., Epistle to the Romans, 15; in Rome, 16, 18; Epistles

of, 16; no "successor," 19; rebukes, St. Peter, 27; said to be "subordinate," 28; faulted by B. and K., 39, 40; visited Spain, very possibly, 87; martyred, 87.
Pearson, Bishop, "Exposition of the Creed," quoted and referred to, 15, 32, 83, 118.
Pentecost, a great feast, 13, 14.
Persons, no attacks on, 10.
Peter, St., question as to his connection with the Church in Rome, 15; no certainty, 16; accepted tradition that he went to Rome and died there, 16–18; query as to "successors," 18; *Petros* and *petra*, meaning of, 21–23; primacy, what it was, 24; said to be superior to St. Paul, 27, 28; the Lord's question to, 28–30; closing years of, 30; "merits" of, 60.
Peter of Blois, 133.
"Petrine Claims" (Littledale), 56.
Phillpotts, Bishop, Letters to Charles Butler, 49, 115, 116; on idolatry of papists, 115, 116; quotes Bishop Fisher, 128, 129; on the Real Presence, 145.
"Pio Nono's Prayer Book" (Milner), full of idolatrous language, 119, 120.
Pius IV., Creed of, 38, 75, 126.
Pius VII., 46; resurrected the Jesuits (1814), 110.
Pius IX., daring words of, 156, 157.
"Plain Reasons" (Littledale), 56.
Pontiff, Roman, "infallible," 24.
Pope's infallibility (1870), 37, 75, 139.
Pope's intervention desired by some, 93.
Pope's supremacy, Dr. Barrow on, 59; revelation from God needed to establish, 59.
Popish priests infallible teachers, 38, 39.
Porter, President, on Jesuit education, 111.
Portugal, Don Carlos snubbed by the pope, 104.
Power of the Keys, 25, 26.
Pretensions, wicked, 39, 40.
Primacy of St. Peter, 24.
"Private judgment," hated by Romish hierarchy, 80; Holy Scripture slandered by popish disputants, 80, 81.
"Privileges of Peter," 18, 28.
Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States, 95, 96.
"Protestant heretics," 45, 96, 97.

Purgatory, Romish, why invented, 126; Baltimore Catechism quoted, 128.
Pusey, Dr., strange statement and argument, 186.

Q.

Queen Elizabeth of England, 90–92.

R.

Radbert, Peter (ninth century), 150.
Ratramn's book, valuable, 132.
"Real Presence," popish view condemned, 142, 143; the true doctrine, 143.
"Received," "delivered" (St. Paul), popish notion of, 89.
Relics, worshipped, 122.
Religious orders in Romish Church, 99, 101.
Review and Synopsis, Part I., 62–64.
" " " " II., 160–162.
Rheims New Testament, on St. Paul's rebuking St. Peter, 27.
Rheims Version of New Testament, 78; Douay Version of Old Testament, 78, 79.
"Rock," who or what meant by this? 21, 22.
Rome, planting of Church in city of, 13–15; made up of Jews and Gentiles, 15; "spots of light" in history of, 68.
Romanists, English, numerous and strong, 94, 95.
Romish system of religion, popery, papalism, etc., 9–11, 69; "biding its time," 97.
"Royalties of Peter," 68.
Rufinus (third century), 76.
Ryder, H. I. D., his book, etc., 50–61; attempt to answer Littledale's "Plain Reasons," 56; glorification of the Romish Church, 60; his book of no great moment, extravagant claims, etc., 60, 61.

S.

"Sacrifice of the Mass," shocking impiety, 150, 151.
Sardican canons, help to popery, 61, 164.
"Satisfactions," what? 128.
Schismatics, Romish, in England, 94, 95.
Scotus Erigena, J. (ninth century), 133.
Scripture, Holy, 71–81; popish charge against, of darkness, difficulty, etc., 72–74.

Scripture texts used by papists, 21–30.
Seabury, Dr. S., on Church of England, 91.
"Secular arm," what meant by, 61.
Sixtus V. and Clement VIII., shabby treatment of the Vulgate, 79.
"Society of Jesus," i.e., the Jesuits.
Socrates, the historian, 35.
Southey, Robert, on Milner and company, 42, 49, 99.
"Speaking authority," according to papists, 41.
St. Matthew, St. Luke, St. John, critical examination of texts quoted from, by papists, 21–32.
"Statutes" against popish impositions, 88, 89.
Stephen, bishop of Rome (middle of third century), "idiot" claim of, 51, 52.
"Strangers of Rome," 14.
"Successors" of St. Peter, 18, 28.
"Supreme Judge in controversy," 32.
System of Romish religion, 9–11, 69, 156.

T.

Taxæ Cameræ Apostolicæ, vile book, 130, 131.
"Teaching by word of mouth," B. and K.'s notion as to, 40, 72.
"Temporal Sovereignty" of popes, 25.
Tertullian, 35, 37, 76, 148.
Theodoret, quoted, 35, 136, 137, 149.
Thorndyke, Dr., as to idolatry in the Church of Rome, 116, 117.
Tillemont, Romish critic, 16.
Tillotson, Archbishop, quoted, 137, 138.
Todd, J. H., Testimony, etc., 76.
Tradition, exalted by papists, 74.
Transubstantiation, a Romish manufacture, 132; insult to all Christian people, no foundation but in a priest's word, 133–135; curses freely bestowed, 135; fallacy of appeals to God's almighty power, 138, 139; condemned by the Church of England, 143.
Translations of the Bible, popish view, 72, 73; value of at the Reformation, 77; hated by papists, 77, 78.
Trent, Council of (1545–1563), 74, 133, 135, 154, 157.
Trevern's pitiful plea, 123.
Trevor, Canon, on the Eucharist, 153.
Tyndale's Version of Greek New Testament, 78.

U.

"Unanimous consent" of the Fathers, what? 23.
United States, policy of as to Religious Denominations, 96; Protestant Episcopal Church in, 95, 96.
Unity, prayer for, 114.
"Unwritten word," held to be equal to God's own "written Word," 72.
Urban II., pope, 129.
Use, Holy Scripture of "no use" in certain cases, say Berington and Kirk, 40.

V.

Vasquez (1600) quoted, 122, 123.
Vatican Gathering (1870), decrees of, 11, 23–25, 42, 69, 75.
"Veneration," what? 113.
"Venial sins," what? 128.
Victor I., pope, 51; a "successor" of St. Peter, 51.
Victor II., pope, sale of indulgences, 129.
Vincent of Lerins (fifth century), 35.
Virgin, the Blessed. See *Mary*.
Visible Church, visible head, the fancy of, 20.
Vulgate, Latin, how treated. See *Sixtus V.*

W.

Wake, Archbishop, referred to, 153.
Watson, "Important Considerations," 111.
Whitby, Council of (England) favored Rome, 88.
Whittingham, Bishop, and Jewell's Apology, 47.
William, the Conqueror, 88.
Williams, Bishop, Notes on Bishop Browne's Exposition of the Articles, 132, 133.
Wiseman, N., schismatic intruder into England, 95; flourishes and pompous outburst as to idolatry, 113. See *Palmer's Letters to Wiseman.*
"Word of mouth teaching," 38–40, 72
Wyckliffe, translation of New Testament into English, 77, 78.

TWO WORKS FOR BIBLE READERS.

A Handbook of Biblical Difficulties; or, Reasonable Solutions of Perplexing Things in Sacred Scripture. Edited by Rev. ROBERT TUCK, B.A. With ample indexes. 568 pages. 8vo, cloth, $2.50.

"This book, we think, will prove very helpful to many minds. Ours is a sceptical age. Never before has the Bible had to meet so many and such fierce assaults. It has been attacked by the critic, the scientist, the historian, and the moralist. Its difficulties have been exaggerated and its meanings misrepresented. Objections are brought against it everywhere, among the working as well as among cultured scholars. And what we need is a fair reasonable reply to these objections; a satisfactory explanation of the difficulties which every thoughtful mind encounters in reading the Bible. This is furnished us, to a large extent, in the book before us. It is the work of a calm, judicious scholar, who seems to know just what is required by perplexed minds at the present time. It is characterised throughout by good sense, avoiding on the one hand the manufacturer of difficulties, and not shrinking, on the other, from such as are real."—*The Church Press.*

Echoes of Bible History. By W. PAKENHAM WALSH, D.D., Bishop of Ossory. With fifty illustrations. 12mo, cloth, $1.50.

"It is a valuable work, and we do not know where so much knowledge can be obtained concerning recent discoveries, in so small a compass."—*Churchman.*

"Very little that has occurred in the annals of Biblical Archæology during the last half century is here omitted."—*The Critic.*

THOMAS WHITTAKER,

2 and 3 Bible House, - - New York.

☞ A GREAT WORK FOR BIBLIOPHILES AND BIBLE STUDENTS

EARLY BIBLES OF AMERICA

A Descriptive Account of All Bibles Published in the United States, Mexico and Canada

By JOHN WRIGHT, D.D.

RECTOR OF ST. PAUL'S CHURCH, ST. PAUL, MINN.

THIRD EDITION, REVISED AND ENLARGED

Octavo, Half-Leather Binding, Gilt Top, - - Price, $3.00 Net

"In the present edition of this interesting book, Dr. Wright has virtually rewritten the original work, and has added to it sixteen entirely new chapters, and has introduced thirty-three new illustrations, which are *fac-simile* reproductions of pages of old American Bibles. The labor he has expended upon the task shows it to have been a real labor of love. With exemplary patience he has collected all the information which is now attainable of the Eliot Bibles, the Saur Bible, the Aitken Bible, the first Douay version, the Thomas Bible, the Collins Bible, the first Bible published in New York, the translation from the Septuagint, the first Hebrew Bible, the first translation from the Syriac, early editions of the Greek Testament, early German Bibles, paragraph Bibles, pronouncing Bibles, and Indian Bibles, grouping under these and other headings a wonderful amount of curious information. In short, the work is a thesaurus of the American Bibliography of texts and editions of the Sacred Scriptures, and it is so complete that it is not likely to be superseded by any other similar work."—*The Church Standard.*

"Collectors of American books and students of the history of the Bible in America will find Dr. Wright's work simply indispensable."
—*The Boston Beacon.*

"Bishop Phillips Brooks called the first edition 'a thorough and satisfactory piece of work that will attract many readers.' Scholars all over the world, like Ellicott, of England, and Ebers, of Germany, praised it. But this superb edition more than doubles the usefulness of the former."—*Mail and Express*, New York.

"It scarcely need be said that the new edition of Dr. Wright's work is what the first was not—a valuable addition to a branch of bibliographical literature that is exceptionally rich in editions and in perplexing problems. Special chapters have been prepared on Mexican and Canadian Bibles, and the author has endeavored to make his work the more reliable by visiting most of the collections where noted Bibles are preserved. The work is well printed and bound."—*The Evening Post*, New York.

THOMAS WHITTAKER, Publisher

2 and 3 Bible House - - New York

CANON FARRAR'S SERMONS.

I.

EVERY-DAY CHRISTIAN LIFE;

Or, Sermons by the Way.

"These sermons by Canon Farrar are the ordinary discourses of a parish priest to a customary congregation. They are upon subjects of every-day life. There is no wide-ranging speculation among them; nothing to gratify the seeker after suggested heresies, or at least the novelties of modern rationalism. But they are very delightful sermons to read—full of tender thought and happy suggestion, and written in a style which when the English clergy do attain it is one of the happiest known to the pulpit. As the other extreme of English preaching, the dead-and-alive manner of mere perfunctory talk is hateful to the last degree, so is this, its opposite, peculiarly pleasant."—*The Churchman.*

II.

TRUTHS TO LIVE BY:

A Companion to "Every-Day Christian Life."

12mo, cloth, $1.25.

"This is a volume of practical sermons written in a style free from mere technical language. The discourses are just what Dr. Farrar claims them to be—simple pastoral sermons. They deal mainly with doctrinal and fundamental subjects as they represent an attempt 'to make clear some of the most essential truth of Christian faith.'"
—*The Observer.*

IV.

THE VOICE FROM SINAI:

Sermons on the Ten Commandments.

8vo, cloth, $1.50.

"With such a subject and so fertile a mind to present it, the warnings of Sinai cannot fall unheeded upon any one who reads Canon Farrar's presentation of them. Indeed, one who did not know the author's own views on certain subjects would get no inkling of them here. These sermons are a clear, exact, earnest and orthodox presentation of the great ten words, and deserve only words of commendation."
—*The Interior.*

V.

SERMONS ON THE LORD'S PRAYER:

Uniform with "The Voice from Sinai."

8vo, cloth, $1.50.

"The attractiveness of the preacher may be judged not a little by the sermons of this volume. There are eighteen of them in all, the first one having for its text, 'After this manner pray ye,' and the last two having for their subject 'Amen.' To each one of them the author brings the fulness of his ripest years, and a wealth of historical allusion, poetical quotation, and deep spiritual fervor, which makes all his writings so attractive."—*The Golden Rule.*

THOMAS WHITTAKER,

2 and 3 Bible House, - - New York.

STUDIES IN THE BOOK OF ACTS.

By the Right Rev. J. WILLIAMS, D.D., LL.D. 8vo, cloth, price, $1.50.

"It is a great boon to the Church that the Presiding Bishop has consented to give to the public his lectures on the Book of Acts."

—*The Churchman.*

"A very important contribution to the early history of the Church, and one which will lay all teachers, especially those who have to do with that period, under lasting obligations."—*St. Andrew's Cross.*

"He does not dogmatize on uncertainties, though he is positive and clear."—*The Literary World.*

"The fragmentary and desultory way in which Scripture is too often read, is not the way by which it is to be understood. To read a continuous history, like that in the Acts, in this manner, there is no possibility of knowing its meaning. So one object the distinguished author has is, without commenting upon verses, to put its history before the reader so as to be understood as history. He divides his volume into four parts—'The Fifty Days,' 'The Birthday of the Christian Church,' 'The Mission to the Jews,' and 'Preparations for the Mission to the Gentiles.' Another volume will tell its further history."

—*Southern Churchman.*

"It was a very happy thought which led the writer to undertake to favor a more natural, orderly and intelligent perusal of the Acts of the Apostles. He truly says that no man would dream of reading ordinary history, whether ecclesiastical or secular, in the fragmentary and desultory way in which many read the Acts of the Apostles."

—*Congregationalist.*

THOMAS WHITTAKER,

2 AND 3 BIBLE HOUSE, NEW YORK.

DIABOLOLOGY.

THE PERSON AND KINGDOM OF SATAN.

The Bishop Paddock Lectures for 1889.

By the Rev. EDWARD H. JEWETT, D.D., LL.D. Second Edition. 12mo, cloth, $1.50.

CONTENTS: Lecture I.—Introductory. Lecture II.—Moral Probation. Lecture III.—Satanic Personality. Lecture IV.—Parsee and Hebrew Views Compared. Lecture V.—Christ's Teaching with Regard to Evil and the Evil One. Lecture VI.—The Sixth Petition of the Lord's Prayer.

"The lectures are timely and able, and ought to have a strong influence in counteracting the pernicious and baseless modern theory that Satan is only the personification of a mere force. The author's reasoning is unanswerable; he always is fair to opponents, and he has done good and abiding service. His pages are especially rich in researches and comparisons which bring out the differences between the Hebrew and the Parsee, or other beliefs in regard to Satan and evil spirits in general. He seems to quite disprove the hypothesis that the Jews borrowed the ideas of the Persians on these subjects."

—*The Congregationalist.*

"He has carefully and critically examined the various views and teachings on this subject to bring out with great logical clearness the truth of the personality of Satan as taught in the New Testament as well as in the rest of Holy Scripture."—*The Churchman.*

"The author deserves credit for the boldness and clearness with which his investigation is conducted."—*The Virginia Sem. Magazine.*

"Although written primarily for the scholarly public, the style is simple and the language clear and easily comprehensible by the ordinary reader."—*The Philadelphia Press.*

"This volume discusses, in a thorough and scholarly manner, the question of the personality of spirits, good and evil, their probation, and the place assigned to them in the teachings of the Bible."

—*National Baptist.*

THOMAS WHITTAKER,

2 AND 3 BIBLE HOUSE, NEW YORK.

Christianity in Daily Conduct.

Studies of Texts relating to Principles of the Christian Character.

Crown octavo, 338 pages, neat cloth binding. Price $1.50.

"It is one of those books, of which we have too few, which can be read and re-read with growing interest and satisfaction and always with renewed instruction and profit."—*Christian At Work.*

"It seems a pity that a book containing such decided opinions on many questions should not have the endorsement of the writer's name."—*Publisher's Weekly.*

"This is a volume of exceptional excellence. The author of these twenty-two sermons should have not concealed his personality. The style is lucid, the argument strong, the purpose direct, the spiritual uplift continuous. The thoughts are very rich, and there is nothing slipshod in their arrangement. The topics are selected by a master-spirit, who knows what man needs and how to supply his need. Many a volume of sermons announced with flourish of trumpets and supported by illustrious names contains less than this. It is in the conduct of daily life that Christianity declares itself, and the wise adaption of precept and parable to the minute duties of each day shows not only the skill of the writer, but the breadth and beauty of Christian truth. Humility, forgiveness, anger, purity, lying, giving, heavenly citizenship, the one talent, the Elder Brother, are all treated with a calm spirit, and a clear apprehension of the true Christian doctrine. It is a pleasure to read these pages, free from the restless drive of an excited passion. The author can afford to give his name in the next edition, and furnish more sermons for publication."—*Christian Union.*

"It is a book a layman might have written, and which it will do good for a layman to read. For our own part, reading between the lines, we incline to the clerical origin, and we do not believe we should have to go far from a prominent parish in this city, to put our hands upon its minister and to say: 'Thou art the man.' But be this as it may, we welcome the volume, both for its subject and treatment. It is Christianity applied, and that is the great need of our day. The libraries are loaded down with treatises, many often stupid, on dogma and doctrine; the clergy preach about the ceremonial and the aesthetics of religion, its clothes and drapery, and what men want to know about is its flesh and blood, its life."—*Mail and Express, N. Y.*

*** *Copies will be forwarded by mail or express, prepaid, at* $1.50.

THOMAS WHITTAKER,

2 and 3 Bible House, New York.

REASON AND AUTHORITY IN RELIGION.

By J. MACBRIDE STERRETT, D.D., Professor of Ethics and Apologetics in Seabury Divinity School. Author of "Studies in Hegel's Philosophy of Religion." 12mo, cloth, $1.00.

Press Notices:

"A philosophical, keen and clever mind has given us in brief form, one of the most satisfactory studies upon these important topics that we ever tried."—*The Living Church.*

"A thoughtful and prudent balancing of the arguments and considerations that are apt to be uppermost in the speculations of open and inquiring minds in these times."—*The Independent.*

"I have never seen so much thought put into so narrow limits or so clearly and concisely stated."—*Rev. E. A. Warriner.*

"This book is a vigorous essay on the burning question regarding the seat of authority in religion. It is marked throughout by candor, vigor and incisiveness of thought and will repay a careful reading."—*The New Englander and Yale Review.*

"The author of this volume has already become favorably known to all thinkers upon such themes by his 'Studies in Hegel's Philosophy of Religion.' His honesty and fairness, his clearness of statement, and the vigor of his style unite to form a model in this method of discussion. It is a book compelling close thought, and filled with stimulating, healthful, interesting work for good thinkers or those who would become such."—*Public Opinion.*

"He writes as a scholar and a philosopher, and his discussion in the present work is timely and fitted to restrain adventurous minds from dangerous extremes."—*The Interior.*

THOMAS WHITTAKER,
PUBLISHER,
2 & 3 BIBLE HOUSE, NEW YORK.

